REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 922 24
OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE AND MOBILITY IN THE URBANIZING PIEDMONT OF NORTH CAROLINA.
BY- SIMPSON, RICHARD L. AND OTHERS
NORTH CAROLINA UNIV., CHAPEL HILL, INST.RES.SOC.SCI
REPORT NUMBER CRP-722 PUB DATE 60
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-722(8403)
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$10.68 267P.

DESCRIPTORS- *OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE, *CAREER OPPORTUNITIES, *INDUSTRIALIZATION, *BLUE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS, *WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS, SOCIAL MOBILITY, HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES, DROPOUTS, MIGRANT WORKERS, MALES, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA, INDEX OF OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, CENSUS OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

THIS IS A STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE AND OCCUPATIONAL CAREER PATTERNS IN TWO NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITIES. THE OBJECTIVES WERE (1) TO EXPLORE ORIENTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS TOWARD VARIOUS GROUPS WHICH INFLUENCE THEM, AND (2) TO DETERMINE THE VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF THESE INDIVIDUALS. SAMPLES OF 400 ADULT WHITE MALE WORKERS WERE DRAWN FROM EACH BLOCK AND SUBJECTS INTERVIEWED WITH AN INSTRUMENT DESIGNED TO ELICIT INFORMATION ON REFERENCE GROUP, VALUE ORIENTATIONS. THIS INFORMATION WAS RELATED TO THE WORK HISTORIES (CAREER MOBILITY) OF THE OLDER ADULTS AND THE OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE PROCESSES (INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY) OF THE YOUNGER ADULTS. IN ADDITION, THE SAME MEASURES WERE USED WITH ALL WHITE MALE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN THE COMMUNITIES AND THE DATA RELATED TO THE ASPIRATIONS (ANTICIPATED INTERGENERATIONAL AND CAREER MOBILITY) OF THE RESPONDENTS. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS SHOWED ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VARIABLES, SUCH AS UPWARD MOBILITY AND DEGREE OF INSTRUMENTALISM IN VALUE ORIENTATION. THERE WAS THE TENDENCY TOWARD INHERITANCE OF GENERAL OCCUPATION LEVEL, WITH HIGH-STATUS FATHERS TENDING TO HAVE HIGH-STATUS SONS AND LOW-STATUS FATHERS TENDING TO HAVE LOW-STATUS SONS. AS IN THE FINDINGS OF OTHER RECENT STUDIES, THERE WAS A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF UPWARD INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY AND A LESSER AMOUNT OF UPWARD INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY. ONE IMPLICATION OF THE SIMILARITY OF FINDINGS TO OTHER STUDIES IS THAT THE LIFE-CHANCES OF A WORKER WHO STARTS FROM A GIVEN PLACE IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE ARE ABOUT THE SAME IN NORTH CAROLINA AS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES. (JL)

ED002922

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE AND MOBILITY IN THE URBANIZING PIEDMONT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Cooperative Research Branch Project No. 722(8403)

by

Richard L. Simpson, David R. Norsworthy, and H. Max Miller

with the assistance of John R. Earle

Institute for Research in Social Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill
1960

The research reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the report of a research project which has had several sponsors. The project was carried out with financial support from two main sources: the U. S. Office of Education, whose support is gratefully acknowledged on the title page, and the Urban Studies Program of the Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, which in turn was supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation for a general program of studies of urbanization in Piedmont North Carolina. The University of North Carolina Research Council also made grants available for selected portions of the research. The University of North Carolina's Institute for Research in Social Science provided office space and research facilities.

So many people helped in the research that it is possible to name only a few of them here. For encouragement and assistance in developing the research proposal and securing financial support, we are indebted to Daniel O. Price, Director of the Institute for Research in Social Science, and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr., Director of the Urban Studies Program. Ruth Searles, Assistant Director of the Institute, and Frances Schnibben, Office Manager, kept the wheels running smoothly during all stages from inception to completion of the project. The interview program was made possible by the cooperation of officials in three North Carolina cities, especially J. D. MacIntosh, Marvin R. McIver, and Jesse R. James of Burlington, Bruce Turney of Graham, and Tom Davis of Raleigh. We are also grateful to several North Carolina school officials for their permission to study their students and their assistance in administering

questionnaires: Dean B. Pruette, Superintendent of High Point City Schools; D. P. Whitley, Principal of High Point Senior High School; G. S. Willard, Superintendent of Wilson City Schools; W. Willard Woodard, Principal of Fike Senior High School, Wilson; and G. R. Brown, Principal of Hillsboro Senior High School.

The research itself was a joint product, and a word about the division of labor may be in order. The three authors and John R. Earle, whose contribution is acknowledged on the title page, all worked on many phases of the study. Simpson was over-all coordinator and is responsible for the basic research plan and for putting this report in its present form. Norsworthy took part in interviewing and data processing; did much of the IBM analysis, including analysis planning and interpretation of results for Chapter 2 and, with the assistance of Earle, all of the scaling; prepared the high school questionnaire and supervised the coding and IBM work on this part of the study; and wrote portions of Chapters 2 and 3. Miller prepared part of the interview schedule; planned and supervised the sampling; served as field director in charge of interviewing; took part in data processing and IBM analysis, including analysis planning and interpretation of some of the results given in Chapter 2.

Other interviewers were Douglas Gatlin, Burton Onstine, and Robert O. Pickard. Harry C. Kirschner did most of the coding and IBM work on the high school questionnaires. Josef Perry and Harriet Presser also did some questionnaire coding. Ida Harper Simpson gave advice and assistance at various stages. Angell G. Beza of the Institute Statistical Laboratory was a patient instructor and problem-solver whenever we encountered difficulties in the operation of IBM statistical equipment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Sample and Research Methods 4

2 SOCIAL ORIGINS, MIGRATION, AND VERTICAL MOBILITY . . 10

Factors Related to Present Job 12

Intergenerational Mobility 44

Factors Related to First Job 62

Career Mobility 68

Summary of Major Conclusions 85

3 SOCIAL ORIGINS, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, VALUES, AND WORK CAREERS 94

Factors Related to First Job 97

Vocational Counseling and First Job 117

Influence, Values, and Present Job 122

Actual Mobility and Level of Aspiration 127

Main Conclusions of Chapter 3 137

4 SOCIAL ORIGINS, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, AND CAREER PLANS 144

Levels of Occupational Aspiration 145

Some Correlates of Father's Status 148

Choosing an Occupation and Planning for College . 160

Occupational Values and Occupational Plans 163

Personal Influence and Occupational Plans 174

APPENDIX A: THE RESEARCH PROPOSAL 184

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND MARGINAL RESPONSES196

APPENDIX C: HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE AND MARGINAL RESPONSES 234

APPENDIX D: ABSTRACT 251

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Occupations of Workers and Their Fathers: NORC and Present Data (Census Occupational Classes)	13
2	Age of Workers by IOS Level of Present Job	21
3	Educational Attainment by IOS Level of Present Job . .	25
4	Education and Fathers' Occupational Status of White-collar and Blue-collar Workers	26
5	Geographic Origin by IOS Level of Present Job	28
6	Education and Geographic Origin by IOS Level of Present Job	30
7	Education and Type of Community Origin by IOS Level of Present Job	31
8	Detailed Classification of Community Origin by IOS Level of Present Job	34
9	Frequency of Migration Within North Carolina by IOS Level of Present Job	37
10	Frequency of Interstate Migration by IOS Level of Present Job	38
11	Scope of Migration by IOS Level of Present Job	41
12	IOS Levels of Fathers' and Sons' Occupations	42
13	Upward and Downward Mobility According to IOS Levels .	47
14	Upward and Downward Mobility: Comparative Percentages for NORC and Present Data (Census Classification) . .	49
15	Work and Migratory History by Education, Intergenerational Mobility, and Status of Present Job for Selected Categories	50
16	IOS Levels of First Jobs of Workers by Certain Characteristics of Their Origins	52
17	Census Levels of First and Present Occupations	63

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
18	IOS Levels of First and Present Occupations	69
19	Upward and Downward Mobility Based on Census Occupational Classification	70
20	Upward and Downward Mobility Based on IOS	72
21	Age of Entry Into Labor Force and Number of Jobs Held by Workers in Four IOS Levels	76
22	Work and Migration History by Education, Career Mobility, and Status of Present Job for Selected Categories . .	77
23	Father's IOS, Number of Advisers, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value, by IOS of First Job	98
24	Father's IOS, Number of Advisers, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value with Respect to First Job	103
25	Main Adviser by Father's IOS and Number of Advisers (First Job)	105
26	Occupational Value by Father's IOS and Main Adviser (First Job)	106
27	Matrix of First-Job IOS Levels by Father's IOS, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value Types	109
28	Mean and Median IOS Level of First Job by Occupational Value, Controlling Father's IOS and Main Adviser . .	112
29	Mean and Median IOS Level of First Job by Main Adviser, Controlling Father's IOS and Occupational Value . . .	113
30	Vocational Counseling and IOS Level of First Job . . .	119
31	Main Adviser and Number of Advisers with Respect to Present Job, by IOS of Present Job	123
32	Occupational Value for Present Job and for First Job by IOS of Present Job	125
33	Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers to Ten Reissman Aspiration Questions, by Time in Labor Force and Intergenerational Mobility	129

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table — Page

34 Per Cent Citing Career as Chief Occupational Value Influencing Choice of Present Job, by Time in Labor Force and Intergenerational Mobility 131

35 Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers to Ten Reissman Aspiration Questions, by Time in Labor Force and Career Mobility 133

36 Number and Per Cent Citing Career as Chief Occupational Value Influencing Choice of Present Job, by Time in Labor Force and Career Mobility 136

37 IOS Levels of Expected Occupations Among Boys in Two High Schools 147

38 Son's Expected Occupation by Father's Occupation 149

39 Son's Expected Occupation by Father's Occupation (Seniors Only) 150

40 Son's Expected Career Group by Father's Occupation . . . 152

41 Son's Expected Yearly Income by Father's Occupation . . 153

42 Son's College Plans and High School Curriculum by Father's Occupation 154

43 Age When Son First Thought about Expected Occupation, and Difficulty in Deciding on Career, by Father's Occupation 155a

44 Number of Advisers of Son by Father's Occupation 157

45 Career Suggestions of Father and Mother by Father's Occupation 158

46 Age When Respondent First Thought about Expected Occupation, and Difficulty in Deciding on Career, by Level of Expected Occupation 162

47 College Plans, High School Curriculum, and Expected Yearly Income by Level of Expected Occupation 164

48 Reason for Choosing Occupation by Level of Expected Occupation 166

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
49	Reason for Choosing Occupation by Level of Expected Occupation (Seniors Only)	168
50	Occupational Feature Ranked First in Importance, by Level of Expected Occupation	170
51	Agreement with Two Statements Related to Ambition, by Level of Expected Occupation	172
52	Number of Advisers by Level of Expected Occupation . .	175
53	Number of Advisers by Level of Expected Occupation (Seniors Only)	177
54	Career Suggestions of Father and Mother by Level of Expected Occupation	178

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION*

There is reason to believe that the processes through which individuals select and pursue work careers involve great waste of talent and a high amount of personal and social disorganization. People fail to take advantage of available opportunities, or they migrate long distances when opportunities exist close at hand. Communities educate their youth only to lose them in their productive years, or they educate them for the wrong careers in view of the opportunities available locally. Workers enter occupations ill suited to them, and shift from one job to another at great loss to themselves and society. People with high ability fail to seize opportunities which would tap their potentialities.

---

* Since this research includes a study of reference group orientations and values as determinants of occupational choice and mobility, sponsored primarily by the Office of Education, and also a study of rates of mobility and related background variables, sponsored primarily by the Urban Studies Program of the University of North Carolina, each of these sponsors will get somewhat more than it bargained for. Both aspects of the research are reported here. To try to isolate for separate reporting the aspects of the study sponsored by each organization would be a fruitless exercise. Many of the same data were used for both phases of the study, and much of the analysis was conducted simultaneously by the same people. Moreover, the two aspects are complementary, one dealing with how many people exhibit various mobility patterns and the other dealing with social-psychological factors which help to explain which kinds of people exhibit which patterns. In general, the Urban Studies portion of the research is reported in Chapter 2 and the Office of Education portion in Chapters 3 and 4, but no effort has been made to preserve an artificial distinction between the two. It is hoped that the combination of the two into a single report makes it a more useful document than either portion separately would be. This introduction blends relevant sections of the proposal to the Office of Education and the Urban Studies plan. The Office of Education proposal, minus such details as budget and vita of the principal investigator, is given in Appendix A of this report. Deviations from the original Office of Education plan are explained in Appendix A.

The existence of these problems is well known, but we are a long way from understanding how to solve them. This research is meant as a small step in the right direction, and it was undertaken in the belief that any increment to our knowledge of the ways in which people choose careers and select jobs can be useful in several ways. Civic and business leaders in a community need to know something of the sources of the community's labor supply, as an aid in planning for economic growth. Educational planners, teachers, and vocational counselors can all benefit from knowledge of the ways in which people make occupational decisions. An understanding of these things can advance social scientists' awareness of the ways in which social backgrounds, values, and interpersonal influences interact to shape human behavior. With these objectives in mind, we have tried in this research to shed some light on the processes through which people choose and pursue work careers.

Chapter 2 explores the effects of social backgrounds on work opportunities and careers. It reports a survey of work histories of white male workers in two North Carolina communities. Workers in each community were interviewed in an attempt to answer several kinds of questions concerning occupational careers. How do men's occupations in a modern community differ from those of their fathers, and what are some of the things that seem to account for the differences? To what extent are workers' career lines determined by the first jobs they take when they enter the labor market? What are some of the prevalent career patterns by which men arrive at different levels in the occupational structure of the community? What role does migration play in the movement of workers from one job to another? In what ways do advantages and disadvantages of social background affect work careers? Finally, are the North Carolina communities where the research was done typical of the United States as a whole, so that findings on career decisions among their workers can be generalized to other communities?

The occupational mobility patterns described in Chapter 2 provide the structural context for the material presented in Chapters 3 and 4. These chapters deal with factors which affect the career plans and occupational decisions of individuals. The research design views workers' social origins, sources of reference group pressures, and value orientations as influences upon vertical occupational mobility: intergenerational mobility, or sons' occupational levels relative to their fathers' occupational levels, and career mobility, or changes in occupational level during the work careers of individuals. The assumptions behind this research design are that movement up and down the occupational ladder is often the outcome of decisions made by the individual before and during his work career, and that these decisions may be influenced by his own values and by the opinions he hears from his associates.

This will indicate in a general way what the study is about. It has seemed best to save the detailed hypotheses until the chapters where the findings are given.

SAMPLE AND RESEARCH METHODS

Data were collected in two ways. Interviews were conducted with adult workers, and self-administered questionnaires were given to high school students.

The interview data were obtained in the summer of 1959 in two North Carolina communities, Raleigh and Burlington-Graham. The sample was designed to be representative of the white adult males in the labor force of each community. Youths who had not yet taken regular full-time jobs, and retired workers, were excluded from consideration, even though they might be working at part-time or casual jobs. Negroes were also excluded from the sample, since the time and money available for the study would not have permitted a large enough sample to allow adequate control of the racial variable when examining the effects of other variables. The prime criterion in the choice of these two cities for study was their wide differences in occupational composition. Burlington-Graham, two adjoining municipalities and in many respects a single community, is an industrial area with a preponderance of textile manufacturing and related occupations, but with some diversification including a large electrical appliance factory. Raleigh is a center of white-collar and professional occupations. It is the state capital, the home of five colleges (three white and two Negro), and a center of the North Carolina insurance business. By choosing two communities which differed in occupational composition, we hoped to minimize the overrepresentation of some kinds of occupations and underrepresentation of others which would have occurred if we had studied only one of the communities.

Raleigh lies on the dividing line between North Carolina's agricultural East and industrial Piedmont. Burlington and Graham, about 60 miles west-northwest of Raleigh, are in the Piedmont. Preliminary 1960 Census figures gave Raleigh a population of 93,097, and Burlington-Graham a population of 40,251. These figures exclude the suburban populations outside the city limits, but neither community has extensive suburbs.

The sampling procedure was block sampling with complete enumeration within white residential areas. Using maps of the two communities, all white residential blocks in the city limits and surrounding suburbs were numbered, blocks were selected from a table of random numbers, and an effort was made to interview all white male labor force members within the selected blocks.[1] Consultation with local officials and automobile reconaissance trips around the communities enabled us to exclude predominantly nonresidential and Negro residential blocks from the numbering. A few individual Negro families turned up in the selected blocks, but the interviewers by-passed these. When persons included in the sample were not at home, interviewers called back three or more times in most cases in an effort to secure interviews, but the effort had to be abandoned after one or two call-backs in some instances when the interview period in each community came to an end.

The interview schedule contained 167 items and required from an hour to an hour and a half to administer. The questions were pre-tested in Chapel Hill and Carrboro, North Carolina and revised before being used in the two study locales.

---

[1] A description of this sampling procedure as it applies in rural areas is given in Walter L. Slocum and Carol L. Stone, "A Design for Area Probability Sampling," Rural Sociology, 24 (1959), pp. 176-177.

Certain problems arose in interviewing. We originally hoped to do about 400 interviews in each community, but this hope proved to be unrealistic. Interviewing time was confined mainly to late afternoons, early evenings, and Saturdays. Workers employed on shifts in factories, and other night workers, could sometimes be interviewed in the morning or early afternoon; but it took time to learn the prevailing shift arrangements for different plants and to identify housing areas with these plants. Despite this problem, interviewers averaged about two daily interviews apiece in Burlington and Graham, but this figure dropped to barely more than one a day in Raleigh. The most likely reasons for the lower daily interview rate in Raleigh are that it is a white-collar city where more people work from eight to five and cannot be reached for interview in the afternoon, that white-collar people spend more time in activities away from home, and that slightly more resistance and refusals were encountered among middle-class people, the predominant group in Raleigh, than among working-class people, the predominant group in Burlington-Graham. Absences due to summer vacations also created problems, especially in Raleigh.

Fortunately, the failure to interview in as many blocks as originally hoped did not affect the randomness of sample selection, since the sampling procedure was to open blocks for interview in the order in which they were randomly drawn--a procedure which preserves randomness of block selection no matter when the interviewing must be stopped.[2] Within the sampled blocks, however, the precentage of interviews completed was held down by the inability to make enough call-backs in some instances when residents were not at home. About ten weeks were available for interviewing, and some blocks had been opened but not finished when the interviewing team moved from Burlington-Graham to Raleigh in the middle of the summer and again when interviewing had to be stopped at the end of the summer. Some, but not all, of the incompleted blocks were finished during the fall.

In spite of these difficulties, the interview sample and method seem to have been generally adequate. Defining the sample as all known white male labor force members in all blocks where any interviewing was done, completed and usable interviews amounted to 380 in a sample of 541, or 70 per cent. The 161 missing interviews included three which were thrown out because in the coders' judgment they had too much information left out to be usable, and fourteen refusals. Project resources did not permit follow-up of nonrespondents to assess sample bias, and in the absence (as this is written) of recent detailed Census data, we cannot make an accurate estimate of the amount or nature of sample bias. It is likely that the sample underrepresents people at the bottom of the social and educational distribution, but not by much. Since the populations being sampled did not include part-time workers, women, or Negro men, the sample is not meant to be representative of the entire labor force in either community. Of the 380 completed and usable interviews, 263 were in Burlington-Graham and 117 were in Raleigh.

---

[2] Slocum and Stone, op. cit., discuss this advantage of the sampling procedure that was used. We deviated slightly from this ideal in one respect. If a block could not be finished on a given day because the only people not yet interviewed were not at home, rather than do nothing the interviewer opened a new block. This eliminated idle time and increased the number of interviews obtained, but it reduced the percentage of interviews completed within the blocks that were opened; more briefly, it sacrificed some randomness to achieve a larger sample.

Thanks to the generous cooperation of school officials, the high school questionnaire administration was much simpler than the interviewing. We had only to deliver the questionnaires to the schools and pick them up, two days later. Teachers administered the questionnaires in regular classrooms during school hours, after being instructed in uniform administration procedures by the principals. The school questionnaire was pre-tested in Hillsboro, North Carolina, revised, and administered in the white high schools of Wilson and High Point, North Carolina.[3] Not only the teachers and school administrators, but also the students in these schools were very helpful. Despite the fact that they were allowed to refuse cooperation if they wished, more than 89 per cent of the students in both schools returned the questionnaires; and most of the rest were absent from class when the questionnaires were administered. In all, 671 usable questionnaires were obtained in Wilson and 1,132 in High Point. The kinds of answers the students gave indicated that they took the task seriously. Not a single questionnaire had to be thrown out because of whimsical or absurd answers, and only four were too incompletely filled out to be used.

---

[3] The original plan to give the high school questionnaires and interviews in the same communities would have delayed the high school study, and was therefore abandoned. It would have been necessary to wait longer than we wanted to wait, because of the extreme pressure of other school events in the communities where the interviews had been conducted; in one community, these other events included a very recent mass questionnaire administration, similar to ours, by another research project of the Institute for Research in Social Science. We want to emphasize that the decision not to administer high school questionnaires in Raleigh or Burlington-Graham was not due to any lack of cooperativeness on the part of their school officials.

Like Raleigh and Burlington-Graham, Wilson and High Point were selected for study because they have widely differing social structures and the two of them combined cover a wide range of occupations. Wilson, in eastern North Carolina, is an agricultural market center in a section devoted chiefly to tobacco growing. High Point, in the Piedmont slightly west of the center of North Carolina, is a manufacturing center whose main product is furniture. Preliminary 1960 Census figures gave High Point a population of 61,652 and Wilson a population of 28,578. The Wilson high school district also includes some of the rural area outside the city.

Chapters 2 and 3 will report data obtained in the interviews, and Chapter 4 will report findings from the high school questionnaires. The interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix B and the high school questionnaire in Appendix C.

CHAPTER 2

SOCIAL ORIGINS, MIGRATION, AND VERTICAL MOBILITY*

A wealth of studies have become available in recent years, showing the prevailing patterns of occupational mobility in industrialized societies. Most of these have dealt with intergenerational mobility, the movement of sons into different occupational strata than those of their fathers. A lesser number have treated career (intragenerational) mobility, the movement of workers from one stratum to another during their work careers.[1] Students in this field seem to agree on several major conclusions:

1. There is everywhere some tendency for sons to "inherit" the occupational status levels of their fathers. The higher the occupational status of a father, the higher the status of his sons is likely to be.

2. Despite the tendency toward inheritance of occupational level, there is much mobility of sons to different levels from those occupied by

---

* The findings given in this chapter are also reported, with some of the details simplified for lay consumption, as Chapter 13 in F. Stuart Chapin, Jr., ed., Urban Growth Dynamics (New York: John Wiley and Sons), to appear in 1961 or 1962.

[1] For an up-to-date summary of work on occupational mobility with extensive bibliographic citations, see Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), especially ch. II, by Lipset and Hans L. Zetterberg, "Social Mobility in Industrial Societies," which deals with intergenerational mobility. An annotated bibliography of articles on mobility in American sociological journals from 1924 to 1953 is given in Raymond W. Mack, Linton Freeman, and Seymour Yellin, Thirty Years of Research and Theory (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1957).

their fathers. Intergenerational mobility is more often upward than downward. The main reason for the general upward trend is that new occupations in a modern society tend to require more skill and responsibility than the older occupations they displace. As technology and productivity advance, white-collar jobs increase at the expense of manual jobs. Also a factor, though of less importance, is differential fertility. The upper social strata have fewer children than the lower strata, thus creating room at the top into which lower-class sons may move.

3. The first regular full-time job a worker takes is predictive of his occupational level throughout his career, largely because the first job usually reflects the amount of education he has had. A highly educated worker usually begins his career in the upper occupational ranks and stays there. A worker with little education usually starts near the bottom and finds it hard to escape.

4. Nevertheless, there is considerable mobility during work careers, and most of it is upward. Workers move up by acquiring seniority, experience, capital, and better knowledge of available opportunities.

In this chapter we shall see to what extent the intergenerational and career mobility patterns in two North Carolina communities resemble the patterns observed elsewhere and partly summarized above. In addition, we shall examine some of the social background factors associated with mobility into different occupational strata. From the interviews with 380 workers in Burlington-Graham and Raleigh, we can classify men according to (1) their current job strata, (2) whether these jobs represented upward intergenerational mobility, stability, or downward mobility,

(3) the strata of the first full-time jobs they held, and (4) whether their subsequent career patterns represented upward career mobility, stability, or downward mobility. Having thus classified the men, we can explore the social background characteristics and geographic migration histories of workers with different mobility patterns at different occupational levels.

One type of analysis will try to disentangle by cross-tabulation the effects of different background characteristics on mobility chances: for example, what are the relative effects of social class background and educational achievement on a worker's occupational chances, when one of these is high and the other is low? Another type of analysis will attempt to discover whether similar factors account for similar patterns of mobility from different starting points: for example, does migration play the same role in mobility from the bottom to the middle of the occupational hierarchy as it plays in mobility from the middle to the top? The procedure will be to give the findings, comparing some of them with findings from other studies, then to summarize the findings and draw a few conclusions from them.

FACTORS RELATED TO PRESENT JOB

Father's occupation. Table 1 shows the principal occupations held by the fathers of men in different occupational categories in our sample, when the men in our sample were in their teens, and gives roughly comparable data from a nationwide sample survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1947. The occupational categories are adapted

TABLE 1. Occupations of Workers and Their Fathers: NORC and Present Data
(Census Occupational Classes)

			Per Cent Whose Fathers Were							
Present Occupation		N	Profes-sionals	Mana-gers	Clerical & Sales	Skilled	Semiskilled & Service	Farm	Unskilled	Tot
Professional persons	Present data	82	13.4	30.5	12.2	11.0	8.5	22.0	2.4	100.0
	NORC	(164)	(23)	(24)	(10)	(13)	(5)	(17)	(7)	(100)
Proprietors, managers, & officials, nonfarm	Present data	85	7.0	27.1	5.9	17.6	16.5	22.4	3.5	100.0
	NORC	(219)	(4)	(31)	(9)	(18)	(8)	(25)	(5)	(100)
Clerks & salespeople	Present data	66	—	22.7	16.7	22.7	18.2	13.6	6.1	100.0
	NORC	(294)	(9)	(23)	(15)	(21)	(10)	(16)	(6)	(100)
Skilled workers & foremen	Present data	49	—	10.2	2.0	28.7	22.4	26.5	10.2	100.0
	NORC	(175)	(3)	(7)	(4)	(30)	(14)	(29)	(12)	(100)
Semiskilled & service workers	Present date	74	—	10.8	2.7	13.5	33.8	31.1	8.1	100.0
	NORC	(224)	(2)	(11)	(6)	(19)	(19)	(32)	(10)	(100)
Unskilled workers, nonfarm	Present data	10	—	10.0	—	10.0	10.0	60.0	10.0	100.0
	NORC	(69)	(3)	(12)	(-)	(9)	(17)	(32)	(20)	(100)

Source of NORC Data: Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure, New York: Rinehart, 1957, p. 260; adapted by Kahl from National Opinion Research Center, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," Opinion News, 9 (September 1, 1947), pp. 3-13.

from those used by the United States Census.[2] A later section of this chapter will delve more thoroughly into intergenerational mobility and related factors. Unless otherwise indicated, the discussion below will concern our North Carolina findings.

As was to be expected, high-status workers, such as professionals and business proprietors, were likely to have high-status fathers, and the converse was even more true, i.e., most low-status workers had low-status fathers. In other words, there was a tendency for sons to "inherit" the occupational levels of their fathers. This finding parallels the findings in all previous studies of which we are aware, and the reasons behind the tendency toward occupational inheritance are rather obvious. A highly educated, occupationally successful father can give his sons many advantages, such as access to higher education, and the home environment of his sons is conducive to achievement motivation and to the acquisition of social skills which are helpful in the occupational world.[3] On the other hand, the son of a low-status worker may have to leave school early to start earning a living; his father probably cannot afford to send him to college; and perhaps most important, his home and neighborhood environment subject him to subtle pressures against high academic or occupational ambition.[4]

---

[2] The nationwide figures are taken from a table in Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure, New York: Rinehart, 1957, p. 260. Kahl's table is his adaptation of figures appearing in National Opinion Research Center, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," Opinion News, 9 (September 1, 1947), pp. 3-13. Kahl's figures are not completely comparable to ours because he has "omitted sons who were service workers, and reclassified the relatively few fathers who were service workers into the categories of unskilled workers." (Kahl, op. cit., p. 274.) His "semiskilled" and "unskilled" categories thus do not correspond exactly to our "semiskilled and service" and "unskilled" categories.

[3] Studies generally show that middle-class homes tend to instill the motivation and the skills to succeed, in subtle ways which go beyond sheer material advantages. For a good general discussion of such studies, see Bernard Barber, Social Stratification, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1957, pp. 307-317. For representative studies, see Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 18 (1953), pp. 142-149; and Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, 18 (1953), 233-242.

The relationship between fathers' and sons' job levels was far from perfect, however, and one would usually be wrong if he tried to guess from a man's occupation what the occupation of his father was. No more than 34 per cent of the men in any category had fathers in the same category, according to our findings, and the highest such figure found in the national NORC survey, except among farmers, was 31 per cent. The lowest percentage of such inherited occupations in the national survey was 15 per cent, in the clerical and sales category; the lowest percentage of inheritance we found was 13 per cent, among professionals. (Our figure of 10 per cent inheritance among unskilled workers is not trustworthy, since we had only 10 respondents in this category.) Thus the percentages of men who had "inherited" their occupational levels ranged from about one-eighth to about one-third in the various occupational groups, and these rates of inheritance would appear much lower

---

4. On such pressures, see Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (Summer 1953), pp. 186-203; Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24 (December 1959), pp. 836-845.

than this if our figures referred to specific occupations rather than to general levels.[5]

Our findings on the relationship between men's occupations and their fathers' occupations compare rather closely to previous findings in nationwide surveys and in surveys of other localities.[6] Such differences as do appear between our findings for the Piedmont and the national pattern as revealed by earlier studies can probably be explained in part by the exclusion of Negroes from our sample, but some of the differences seem to reflect differences between the occupational structures of North Carolina and the nation.[7] For example, Kahl in presenting findings from the 1947 NORC study reports a higher percentage of workers in unskilled occupations that was found in our Piedmont sample, and in five of the six occupational levels, he reports larger percentages of sons whose fathers were unskilled. Both of these differences reflect mainly the fact that Negroes, who were left out of our sample, hold many of the unskilled jobs in North Carolina. Our sons in all categories except unskilled were more likely to have semiskilled fathers than were sons in the national sample; this finding may reflect the prevalence of semiskilled textile jobs in Piedmont North Carolina, including Burlington-Graham. Our sons in all categories except proprietors and officials were less likely than those in the national sample to have professional fathers, and this reflects the relatively small number of professional persons in North Carolina, especially a generation ago.[8]

---

[5] Natalie Rogoff, *Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953, p. 23, reports that findings similar to these have recurred in many studies of occupational mobility and inheritance. Her own figures for Marion County, Indiana (*op. cit.*, pp. 118-119) report one such study, but her figures represent the likelihood that a father in a given category will have a son in given categories, while ours represent the likelihood that a son in a given category has a father in given categories. This noncomparability means simply that we have run percentages in different directions, but the two approaches produce drastically different results. Declining occupations, such as farming, will appear to have extremely high rates of inheritance if 100 per cent means all sons in these categories, but lower rates of inheritance if 100 per cent means all fathers in these categories. The reverse will be true in expanding occupations, such as those in the professional category. Some differences, though of lesser magnitude, will also result from differential birth rates in the various occupational categories.

[6] Kahl, The American Class Structure, *op. cit.*; Rogoff, *op. cit.*; Richard Centers, "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata," *American Sociological Review*, 13 (April 1948), pp. 197-203; Herman P. Miller, *Income of the American People*, New York: Wiley, 1955, pp. 31-32; Percy E. Davidson and H. Dewey Anderson, *Occupational Mobility in an American Community*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1937; Reinhard Bendix, Seymour M. Lipset, and F. Theodore Malm, "Social Origins and Occupational Career Patterns," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 7 (January 1954), pp. 246-261.

---

[7] Slight differences in definition of the semiskilled and unskilled categories also made for slight differences in apparent mobility rates. Exact comparisons are not possible with the existing data from the various studies, but this source of difference in findings is probably relatively unimportant, since both the fathers and sons in the various samples are affected alike by differences in definition.

[8] To compare the occupational distributions of the fathers' generations represented in our figures and the NORC figures reported by Kahl, which are for sons as of 1947, it would be desirable to compare statistics for the United States in about 1920 and North Carolina in about 1930. Unfortunately, detailed occupational statistics for individual states using the current Census occupational classification are available only for years since 1940. A rough indication of the occupational distribution in North Carolina when the fathers of workers in our sample were of about the same age as the workers when we interviewed them, and of how this compares with the distribution for the United States as a whole a generation before the 1947 study, can be obtained by comparing the 1940 North Carolina distribution with the 1930 United States distribution. The 1940 Census shows the following distribution for North Carolina white males, with some errors

All in all, the similarities between our Piedmont North Carolina findings and the national pattern appear to outweigh the differences, and the similarities seem likely to grow if the Piedmont can continue to attract modern industries. While there is a certain amount of inheritance of general occupational status at both ends of the occupational scale, high-status workers in a modern community include many whose fathers held lower-ranking positions. The opposite situation, that of low-status workers whose fathers were of high status, is much less frequent. More briefly, upward mobility between generations is more common than downward mobility. The main reason for this is that technological progress changes the occupational structure, so that each generation includes relatively more people in white-collar occupations and fewer in manual occupations than the preceding generation. This is true not only in North Carolina and the rest of the United States, but throughout the industrialized parts of the world.[9]

---

due to rounding and nonreporting of occupations: professional, 3.4%; proprietors, managers, and officials (nonfarm), 8.3%; clerks, salespeople, and kindred, 9.5%; skilled workers and foremen, 11.6%; operatives and service workers, 23.7%; farmers and farm laborers, 37.0%; unskilled workers (nonfarm), 5.5%. The 1940 Census also presents figures from the 1930 Census which have been adapted to fit the same classificatory scheme. The 1930 statistics for all United States males are: professional, 4.0%; proprietors, managers, and officials (nonfarm), 9.0%; clerks, salespeople, and kindred, 12.8%; skilled workers and foremen, 16.4%; operatives and service workers, 14.4%; farmers and farm laborers, 24.7%; unskilled workers (nonfarm), 16.1%.

[9] S. M. Lipset and Hans L. Zetterberg, "A Theory of Social Mobility," Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology, London: International Sociological Association, 1956, Vol. III, pp. 155-177; Lipset and Bendix, op.cit., pp. 11-75; see also several references cited by Lipset and Zetterberg in footnote 4, p. 13 of the Lipset and Bendix book, ibid. Higher birth rates in the lower classes, which create "surplus" workers who move up to

Tables 2 through 11 summarize some relationships between respondents' present job levels and several variables: their ages, the educational attainments of their fathers, their own educational attainments, the types of communities in which they grew up, and their places of birth and migration histories. In this table, jobs are classified by Hollingshead's Index of Occupational Status (IOS) rather than by the Census categories.[10] The Hollingshead index, more nearly than the Census occupational classification, is a genuine status scale, in which each category includes occupations of greater responsibility, skill, and prestige than the category below it. Probably its greatest advantage over other occupational scales is that it distinguishes different levels of professional, entrepreneurial, managerial, and farm occupations rather than lumping these types of jobs together as the Census scale does. The occupational scale is divided into seven basic groupings:[11]

---

fill "vacancies" created by lower birth rates in the middle and upper classes, also provide opportunities for upward movement, but in industrial societies changing technology accounts for more upward mobility than differential birth rates. For a demonstration of this for the United States, see Kahl, The American Class Structure, op. cit., pp. 254-258.

[10] The IOS is one of two components, the other being educational attainment, in Hollingshead's two-factor index of social position, whose validation and utility are described in August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, New York: Wiley, 1958. A list of illustrative occupations in the seven IOS levels is given in August B. Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position, mimeographed by August B. Hollingshead, New Haven: 1965 Yale Station, 1957.

[11] The list and examples are taken from John R. Earle, John B. Stephenson, and J. Allen Williams, Jr., "An Exploratory Study of the Occupational Aspirations of Durham Negro High School Students," unpublished manuscript, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1960, pp. 17-18. This paper also has a discussion of the usefulness of the Hollingshead scale and its adaptability to a North Carolina sample. A fuller listing of illustrative occupations is given in Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position, op. cit. We are indebted to Professor Hollingshead for sending us a copy of the latter paper, and to J. Allen Williams, Jr. for suggestions regarding the use of the scale for our purposes.

1. Higher executives, proprietors of large concerns, and major professionals. (For example, doctors, college professors, bank presidents, et al.)

2. Business managers, proprietors of medium sized businesses, and lesser professionals. (For example, owners of businesses with a value of $35,000-$100,000, accountants (not C. P. A.), dietitians, librarians, opticians, pharmacists, public school teachers.)

3. Administrative personnel, small independent businessmen, and minor professionals. (For example, owners of business valued at $6,000-$34,999, advertising agents, private secretaries, purchasing agents, chain grocery store managers, commercial artists, newspaper reporters, oral hygienists.)

4. Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses. (For example, owners of businesses valued at less than $6,000, bill collectors, bookkeepers, claims examiners, clerical and stenographic workers, postal clerks, draftsmen, proofreaders, truck dispatchers.)

5. Skilled manual employees. (For example, bricklayers, cabinet makers, carpenters, diemakers, foremen, horticulturists, millwrights, painters.)

6. Machine operators and semiskilled employees. (For example, hospital aides, bus drivers, cashiers, delivery men, elevator operators, garage and gas station attendants, hairdressers, housekeepers, railroad signalmen.)

7. Unskilled employees. (For example, parking lot attendants, domestic servants, farm helpers, garbage collectors, hod carriers, janitors, laborers, porters, factory workers below the level of machine operators.)

In Table 2 and in subsequent tabulations using the IOS, we have grouped IOS categories 1 and 2 as "A," categories 3 and 4 as "B," category 5 as "C," and categories 6 and 7 as "D." This gives us two nonmanual or high-status levels (A and B) and two manual or low-status levels (C and D).[12]

---

[12] The only exception to this statement that levels A and B are nonmanual and levels C and D are manual arises in connection with tabulations involving respondents' fathers' occupations. Some of the

TABLE 2. Age of Workers by IOS Level of Present Job
(N= 373)

	Status of Present Job*							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
Age of Worker	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 30 years	(11)	11.0	(30)	21.3	(9)	18.0	(14)	17.1
30-44 years	(54)	54.0	(74)	52.4	(25)	50.0	(44)	53.6
45 or more years	(35)	35.0	(37)	26.2	(16)	32.0	(24)	29.3
Total	(100)	100.0	(141)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(82)	100.0

*IOS levels 1 and 2 comprise status A; levels 3 and 4, B; 5, C; and levels 6-7 make up status D.

Age. Table 2 shows the relation of age to present job level! The oldest workers, on the average, were those in the upper white-collar group, A. The youngest were those in the lower white-collar group, B. The two blue-collar groups were in between, and differed little from each other. The greater age of higher-status workers within the white-collar group is what one would normally expect, since many professional and managerial career lines start at lower administrative levels and lead upward through normal promotion. A likely reason for the lack of age differences between the higher and lower blue-collar workers is that young workers today have generally received more education than older workers. Being better educated, the young workers often begin at relatively high levels, so that the trend toward more education in each succeeding generation cancels the relationship one would otherwise expect to find between age and occupational attainment, within the blue-collar group. Thus many an older worker, despite some upward mobility during his career, has a job no better than that of a younger worker who received more education. This interpretation is consistent with the findings on career mobility which are reported later in this chapter.

---

fathers were farmers who owned 100 acres or more, and these were classified in group B. (The median size of North Carolina farms is about 50 acres.) Blau's analysis of the prestige ratings of the 90 occupations covered in the NORC study (op. cit.) shows that some error occurs when all white-collar occupations are ranked above all blue-collar occupations (Peter M. Blau, "Occupational Bias and Mobility," American Sociological Review, 22 [August 1957], pp. 392-399); but Hollingshead and Redlich (op. cit.) show that the Hollingshead index produces good results in predicting behavior; and Lipset and Zetterberg (in Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., pp. 14-17) argue with supporting data from various studies, which they cite, that the manual-nonmanual break is the most significant occupational division despite the high prestige of some skilled manual jobs.

Earlier research by Rogoff leads to the conclusion that a worker's chance of reaching an occupational level above that of his father was about the same in 1940 as it had been in 1910, but that the method of achieving mobility and the age at which the mobility usually took place had changed. In 1910, many workers began as blue-collar employees, then rose into more responsible jobs or started their own businesses after a few years. Career mobility of this type was likely to take place when the worker was 30 or older. By 1940, a blue-collar worker's chance of moving into white-collar work had diminished, but the decline in this kind of mobility was balanced by an increase in the amount of intergenerational mobility achieved through education. The pattern more typical of 1940 was one in which a man either began his career in a white-collar position as the result of education, or began at the blue-collar level and stayed there. Thus in 1940 the amount of mobility between generations was substantially unchanged since 1910, but mobility was more likely to take place at an earlier age, as soon as the worker finished his education. As a result, the relationship between age and occupational status was less in 1940 than in 1910.[13] Rogoff's data were obtained in Indianapolis and we have no comparable data for an earlier period in the North Carolina Piedmont, but a number of our 1959 Piedmont findings are consistent with her interpretation of the 1940 Indianapolis situation.

---

[13] This paragraph summarizes, at the risk of some oversimplification, material presented in Rogoff, op. cit., 91-105 and 110-111.

Education and family background. Table 3 shows the educational attainments of the four classes of workers, and Table 4 cross-tabulates workers' education and their fathers' occupational status. As one would expect, there was a direct relationship between workers' educational background and their occupational status. More than half the workers in the combined white-collar groups (A and B) but only a tiny minority of the blue-collar workers had attended college. To put the matter differently, nearly all who had attended college but fewer than half of those who had not attended college were in white-collar occupations.

Thus we find that obtaining an education vastly improves a worker's chance of obtaining a high-status job. Any other finding would have been quite surprising. We also learned, from figures given in Table 1, that a worker's chances were greatest when his father's occupational status was high. To a large extent, these are not really different findings: a high-status father is likely to send his son to college, or at least through high school, so that the father's status and the son's education are often merely two aspects of the same set of circumstances. It often happens, however, that the son of a low-status father is able to obtain a good education, and it also happens, though less often, that sons of high-status fathers fail to obtain much education. The cross-tabulation shown as Table 4 is aimed at discovering whether the status of a worker's father has an effect on the worker's occupational chances, independently of the amount of education the worker receives.

The answer seems to be that the occupational status of the father does have an independent effect on his son's chances, even when the son's

TABLE 3. Educational Attainment by IOS Level of Present Job
(N= 370)

	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
Education of Worker	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-9 years	(1)	1.0	(24)	17.6	(25)	50.0	(50)	60.2
10-12 years	(8)	7.9	(57)	41.9	(21)	42.0	(31)	37.3
College	(51)	50.5	(54)	39.7	(4)	8.0	(2)	2.4
College graduate plus	(41)	40.6	(1)	0.7	(—)	0.0	(—)	0.0
Total	(101)	100.0	(136)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(83)	99.9

TABLE 4. Education and Fathers' Occupational Status of White-collar and Blue-collar Workers (N= 359)

Father's Occupational Status & Worker's Education	N	Per Cent of Workers Whose Present Job Is		
		White Collar*	Blue Collar**	Total
Father High Status†				
Worker high school graduate	130	94.6	5.4	100.0
Worker not high school graduate	36	36.1	63.9	100.0
Father Low Status†				
Worker high school graduate	97	71.1	28.9	100.0
Worker not high school graduate	96	27.1	72.9	100.0

---

*Status Levels A and B combined.

**Status Levels C and D combined.

† Fathers' status categories are roughly comparable to the sons' "white collar" (high) and "blue collar" (low) categories. However, some fathers had been farmers; these were accorded "high status" if they had owned or managed 100 or more acres at the time the son (respondent) was an adolescent. Farm owners and managers of less acreage, and all tenant classes and farm laborers, were classified as having "low status."

educational level is controlled. Of the workers who had graduated from high school, 95 per cent of those whose fathers were of high status (A or B) but only 71 per cent of those whose fathers were of low status (C or D) were themselves white-collar workers. Of the workers who had not finished high school, 36 per cent of those with high-status fathers but only 27 per cent of those with low-status fathers were in white-collar occupations. A similar conclusion has been reached by West, who finds that college graduates who had to work their way through college made lower average incomes than graduates of the same colleges whose parents paid their college expenses.[14] It appears that an unfavorable family background can hinder the occupational career of even a highly educated worker, and that a favorable background can help to offset a lack of education.[15] Education of the worker seems to have a far more potent effect than his family background when the two are different, however, even though each has some effect.

---

[14] Patricia Salter West, "Social Mobility among College Graduates," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (ed.), *Class, Status, and Power*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953, pp. 465-480.

[15] The degree of relationship between father's status and son's status is actually less than is suggested by our figures. Our "highly educated" sons were all high school graduates, but it is probable that those with high-status fathers were more likely to have gone to college. It is not likely that the relationship we found is wholly spurious, however. The subjects in West's study were all graduates of the same colleges, so that education is almost completely controlled in her study, which reached similar conclusions. Moreover, no spuriousness due to inadequate control of the educational variable is likely to be present in the relationship shown for our non-high-school graduates. Assuming literacy, there is probably little practical differences in today's labor market between greater and lesser amounts of education short of a high school diploma, even if such differences may exist between the sons of high-status and low-status fathers.

TABLE 5. Geographic Origin By IOS Level of Present Job
(N= 372)

Geographic Origin of Worker	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Present city	(13)	13.0	(41)	29.5	(15)	30.0	(26)	31.3
Present county	(4)	4.0	(13)	9.4	(13)	26.0	(16)	19.3
Other N. C.	(42)	42.0	(52)	37.4	(17)	34.0	(29)	34.9
Other state	(41)	41.0	(33)	23.7	(5)	10.0	(12)	14.4
Total	(100)	100.0	(139)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(83)	99.9

Geographic origin. Table 5 shows where workers in the four classes lived during their teens. Higher-status workers tended to have moved farther from their home towns than lower-status workers. Workers reared in states other than North Carolina comprised 41 per cent of those in status group A, 24 per cent of those in group B. but only 10 and 14 per cent, respectively, of those in groups C and D. Conversely, workers reared in the city or county of current residence comprised only 17 per cent of those in group A, 39 per cent in group B, but 56 and 51 per cent, respectively, of the group C and D workers. Thus there was a strong relationship between high status and likelihood of having come from afar, but the relationship was not linear, since it was slightly reversed in the comparison between groups C and D. These findings can be summed up by saying that white-collar workers (A and B) were more likely to have come from outside the local area than blue-collar workers (C and D), and that upper white-collar workers (A) were more likely to have done so than lower white-collar workers (B).

Table 6, which adds the variable of education to the picture, sheds further light on the relationship between occupational status and geographic origin. Nearly all group A workers had been educated through high school or beyond, and most of these, as we have noted earlier, had been reared outside the county of current residence. Looking at the figures in another way, we see that all but two of the 68 workers with at least high school education who had originated in states other than North Carolina were in the two white-collar classes. This was not the case among workers born in Burlington-Graham or Raleigh who were still there; among 57 of these who had been educated through high school or

TABLE 6. Education and Geographic Origin by IOS Level of Present Job
(N= 365)

	Status of Present Job							
Education of Worker By Geographic Origin	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High School Graduate or More								
Present city	(12)	12.0	(28)	20.9	(7)	14.3	(10)	12.2
Present county	(3)	3.0	(3)	2.2	(3)	6.1	(1)	1.2
Other N. C.	(42)	42.0	(41)	30.6	(4)	8.2	(7)	8.5
Other state	(40)	40.0	(26)	19.4	(1)	2.0	(1)	1.2
Less Than High School Graduate								
Present city	(1)	1.0	(12)	9.0	(8)	16.3	(16)	19.5
Present county	(1)	1.0	(9)	6.7	(10)	20.4	(14)	17.1
Other N. C.	(--)	0.0	(9)	6.7	(12)	24.5	(22)	26.8
Other state	(1)	1.0	(6)	4.5	(4)	8.2	(11)	13.4
Total	(100)	100.0	(134)	100.0	(49)	100.0	(82)	99.9

TABLE 7. Education and Type of Community Origin By IOS Level of Present Job (N= 367)

Education of Worker by Community Origin	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High School Graduate or More								
Metropolis	(25)	25.0	(18)	13.3	(2)	4.1	(2)	2.4
Town	(49)	49.0	(62)	45.9	(10)	20.4	(11)	13.2
Farm	(23)	23.0	(20)	14.8	(3)	6.1	(7)	8.4
Less Than High School Graduate								
Metropolis	(1)	1.0	(2)	1.5	(1)	2.0	(3)	3.6
Town	(1)	1.0	(23)	17.0	(21)	42.8	(25)	30.1
Farm	(1)	1.0	(10)	7.4	(12)	24.5	(35)	42.2
Total	(100)	100.0	(135)	99.9	(49)	99.9	(83)	99.9

beyond, 17 were in the blue-collar status groups, C and D. This seems to mean that white-collar employment is associated with breaking the ties of the home community--at least when these North Carolina cities are the places where workers are found and their status measured. This interpretation is consistent with other findings to be presented later, but we would be more certain of it if we had data on out-migrants from these cities.

The lowest status group, D, had proportionately more workers originating outside the state than the skilled blue-collar group, C. Group D may have included a number of "drifters" or hardship migratory repeaters who were less likely to have strong attachments to a home community than the more stable skilled workers in group C. Semiskilled cotton mill work, which was classified in group D, is very often a traditionally inherited occupation, but the tradition seems to allow a considerable amount of migration and a lack of attachment to any one community.[16] Further information on migration will be given below.

Why the relationship between high occupational status and movement from afar into Burlington-Graham and Raleigh? A likely explanation lies in North-South wage differentials and the scale of labor markets for different kinds of workers. Blue-collar wages are considerably higher outside than inside the South and do not vary much within the South; thus it is not surprising that comparatively few workers had migrated long distances into these North Carolina cities to take level C and D jobs. On the other hand, the incomes of professional and managerial workers show more variation within regions and less variation between regions, and thus we find that large numbers of workers had come into the area to accept white-collar positions, especially in group A, which includes professionals and managers. Moreover, the normal recruitment channels for high-status workers are less locally bound than those for manual workers; they involve recruiting among college seniors, newspaper advertisements not confined to the local paper, transfer to company executives from one city to another, and other features which give the white-collar labor market a more than merely local or statewide scale.[17]

---

[16] J. Kenneth Morland, Millways of Kent, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958, gives evidence that mill work is often an inherited occupation.

Tables 7 and 8 give information on the kinds of communities, regardless of their location, in which workers in the different occupational classes lived during their teens. Table 7 gives this information separately for high school graduates and non-high school graduates, and

---

[17] Data on income in North Carolina and the United States as a whole in different Census occupational classes are given in U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1950 Census of Population, Vol. II, Part 33, Table 78, pp. 253-254 (North Carolina data) and Vol. IV, Part 1B, Table 19, p. 190 (U. S. data). The ratio of median income for North Carolina males to median income for U. S. males in 1949, computed from the Census data, was .652, but the ratios were .852, .830, and .884 for professionals, nonfarm managers, and clerical workers, respectively, and only .740, .535, and .719 for skilled workers, service workers, and semiskilled operatives, respectively. (The ratios for all these occupational classes are above the ratio for North Carolina as a whole, since the latter is pulled down by the low incomes of North Carolina Negroes, who are mainly farmers and unskilled workers.) We have no data on the range of incomes in these classes but it seems likely that the ranges in North Carolina and the nation are more similar for high-status incomes than for low-status incomes.

TABLE 8. Detailed Classification of Community Origin By IOS Level of Present Job (N= 374)

	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
Community Origin—Detail	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Metropolis (over 50,000)	(26)	26.0	(20)	14.3	(3)	6.0	(5)	6.0
Medium town (15,000-49,999)	(13)	13.0	(25)	17.8	(5)	10.0	(6)	7.1
Small town (2,500-14,999)	(24)	24.0	(34)	24.3	(8)	16.0	(17)	20.2
Village (less than 2,500)	(11)	11.0	(22)	15.7	(8)	16.0	(5)	6.0
Town, nonspecified	(2)	2.0	(8)	5.7	(11)	22.0	(9)	10.7
Farm, owner	(22)	22.0	(24)	17.1	(9)	18.0	(25)	29.8
Farm, nonowner	(2)	2.0	(7)	5.0	(6)	12.0	(17)	20.2
Total	(100)	100.0	(140)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(84)	100.0

Table 8 uses a more detailed classification of types of community origin. It is not possible to do both at once without unduly reducing the number of cases in some categories.

A strong relationship is indicated between metropolitan origin and high occupational status, even when education is controlled. Of 54 workers reared in cities of 50,000 or larger, 47 had been educated through high school or beyond, and of these, 25 (53 per cent) were in status group A. Only 72 of 185 (39 per cent) of those reared in smaller towns or rural areas and educated through high school or beyond were in group A. (These percentages are obtained by reading across the rows of Table 7 and are not given in the table.)

Within the low-education group, a similar relationship is evident between farm origin and low occupational status. Of 58 workers reared on farms who had not completed high school, 35 (60 per cent) were in status group D, compared with only 28 (36 per cent) of 77 low-education workers reared in towns or cities. (These percentages are also obtained by reading across the rows.)

Within the high-education group, only 49 (37 per cent) of the workers reared in towns of less than 50,000 population were in status group A, compared with 25 (53 per cent) of 47 workers reared in metropolitan areas and 23 (43 per cent) of those reared on farms. Within the low-education group, however, the town-reared did considerably better than the farm-reared, with only 36 per cent of the town reared but 60 per cent of the farm-reared falling in status group D. (These percentages are also obtained by reading across the rows.) Thus it appears that workers reared in towns did not have a clear-cut advantage in occupational competition over those reared on farms; the farm-reared could erase their initial disadvantage by obtaining education through high school or beyond. This finding illustrates the danger of thinking of farm dwellers as a homogeneous category, even in a state with low farm income such as North Carolina, where most of these workers had grown up.[18]

In Table 8, which uses a more detailed classification of communities of origin, a clear division appears between the white-collar group, classes A and B, and the blue-collar group, classes C and D. Groups A and B had relatively high concentrations of workers reared in cities over 50,000 while the two blue-collar groups had relatively few of these urban-reared workers. This fact has already been commented on in discussing Table 7. The near-absence of metropolitan origins among blue-collar workers is very striking, especially since our definition of "metropolitan" includes several North Carolina cities, including Raleigh.[19]

---

[18] Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., p. 206 and elsewhere in ch. 8, show that workers born of working-class fathers in large cities have an advantage over those born of working-class fathers in towns, but that this relationship is reversed among sons of middle-class fathers in these two types of communities. Their data indicate that sons of middle-class fathers in towns average higher occupational status than their counterparts in large cities, because they receive, on the average, more education. We have not attempted to test this hypothesis with out data, because our sample included very few workers from big cities--our line between town and metropolis had to be drawn at 50,000 to include many workers in the metropolitan origin category--and because to make the test would require four-way cross-tabulation, for which we have too few cases.

[19] The classification of home towns as "town" or "metropolitan" probably includes some error due to the difficulty of classifying the size of growing communities at the times when the respondents lived there in their teens.

TABLE 9. Frequency of Migration Within North Carolina By IOS Level of Present Job (N= 373)

Frequency Inter-state Migration	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No moves	(43)	43.0	(73)	52.1	(34)	68.0	(46)	55.4
One move	(25)	25.0	(31)	22.1	(12)	24.0	(20)	24.1
Two moves	(20)	20.0	(20)	14.3	(3)	6.0	(11)	13.2
Three or more moves	(12)	12.0	(16)	11.4	(1)	2.0	(6)	7.2
Total	(100)	100.0	(140)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(83)	99.9

TABLE 10. Frequency of Interstate Migration by IOS Level of Present Job (N= 373)

Frequency of Interstate Migration	Status of Present Job: A (Highest) N	A (Highest) %	B N	B %	C N	C %	D (Lowest) N	D (Lowest) %
No moves	(51)	51.0	(86)	61.4	(36)	72.0	(60)	72.3
One move	(21)	21.0	(26)	18.6	(3)	6.0	(9)	10.8
Two moves	(13)	13.0	(19)	13.6	(8)	16.0	(9)	10.8
Three or more moves	(15)	15.0	(9)	6.4	(3)	6.0	(5)	6.0
Total	(100)	100.0	(140)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(83)	99.9

If we ask where the low-status workers had come from, the answer seems to be, "from the farm," in large numbers. Actually, a sizable proportion of the white-collar workers had also come from farms, but as Table 8 shows, farm-reared white-collar workers were overwhelmingly from families which owned their farms, while almost half the farm-reared blue-collar workers were from farms which their families did not own. These findings, while they show something often concealed in studies which do not distinguish farm tenure classes, are what one would expect. The farm-reared, even in the South, vary a great deal among themselves in their access to higher education and their ability to compete in the urban white-collar world.

Migration within North Carolina. Table 9 shows how many times the workers in the four occupational classes had moved from one community to another within North Carolina during their work careers. In this and all other tabulations of migration unless otherwise indicated, moves in the Armed Services, moves to a different residence within the same community, and moves before taking the first full-time job or in order to take the first job are excluded from consideration.

In all four occupational groups, relatively many workers reported no moves and successively fewer reported one, two, and three or more moves within the state during their work careers. The group reporting the least frequent migration within the state was C, the skilled manual worker group; these workers were strikingly less migratory within the state than the rest were, with 68 per cent of them reporting no such moves and only two per cent (one man among the 50) reporting three or more such moves. With the exception of group C, the higher the status of a worker, the more likely he was to have moved within the state at least once during his career, and the larger the number of intrastate moves he was likely to have made if he had moved at all. To state these findings more simply: both likelihood and frequency of intrastate migration were positively related to occupational status, except that skilled manual workers (group C) were the least migratory within the state of all the groups.

Interstate migration. Table 10 shows how many times the four groups of workers had moved across state lines during their careers. Interstate moves were only slightly less frequent than moves within the state. In general, the higher the occupational status, the greater the likelihood of interstate migration during the work career, except that the two blue-collar groups did not differ appreciably. The most marked difference was that between the two high-status groups, A and B. Nearly half the workers in group A had made one or more interstate moves during their careers, and considering only those who had moved once or more, group A also had the highest average frequency of moves. Fifteen per cent of the workers in group A had made three or more interstate moves, compared with only six per cent in groups B, C, and D.

Scope of migration. Table 11 shows the scope of migration of workers in the four occupational classes. "Scope of migration" refers to the widest separation between any two places where a worker has lived

TABLE 11. Scope of Migration By IOS Level of Present Job (N= 374)

Scope of Migration	Status of Present Job: A (Highest) N	A (Highest) %	B N	B %	C N	C %	D (Lowest) N	D (Lowest) %
None	(18)	17.8	(43)	30.7	(25)	50.0	(37)	44.6
Intrastate, contiguous county	(6)	5.9	(14)	10.0	(7)	14.0	(11)	13.2
Intrastate, noncontiguous county	(25)	24.8	(28)	20.0	(4)	8.0	(11)	13.2
Interstate, contiguous state	(17)	16.8	(23)	16.4	(5)	10.0	(14)	16.9
Interstate, noncontiguous state	(35)	34.6	(32)	22.8	(9)	18.0	(10)	12.0
Total	(101)	99.9	(140)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(83)	99.9

TABLE 12. IOS Levels of Fathers' and Sons' Occupations (N= 366)

IOS Level of Son's Present Job	N	Per Cent Whose Fathers' Occupations Were On Level 1 (High)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Low)	Total
Level 1 (High)	(51)	21.6	19.6	25.5	15.7	11.8	5.9	0.0	100.1
2	(48)	6.2	16.7	27.1	27.1	12.5	10.4	0.0	100.0
3	(63)	1.6	7.9	22.2	12.7	23.8	20.6	11.1	99.9
4	(74)	0.0	6.8	14.9	21.6	29.7	18.9	8.1	100.0
5	(48)	0.0	2.1	10.4	6.2	41.7	18.8	20.8	100.0
6	(71)	0.0	4.2	8.4	14.1	22.5	36.6	14.1	99.9
7 (Low)	(11)	0.0	0.0	18.2	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2	100.1

at any time since his teens, including the place where he lived during his teens. The widest scope, interstate migration involving noncontiguous states, might mean either one long move or a series of shorter moves which took the worker across two or more state boundaries. The categories by which we have classified scope of migration represented very rough concentric bands, but not concentric circles, since they are based on migration across county and state lines rather than distances migrated.

By this measure, group A was the most migratory and group C was the most sedentary. Thus all of the findings on migration parallel each other, except that group D was slightly more sedentary than group C according to one of the three criteria, interstate migration. Workers in group A were considerably more likely than others to have made interstate moves involving noncontiguous states, and they were the least likely to have made no moves at all and to have made only intrastate moves from contiguous counties. Even among those who had made no interstate moves, these high-status workers were least likely to have made no moves or to have moved only from contiguous counties. Groups C and D were rather similar to each other in scope of migration, with group B intermediate between these blue-collar groups and group A.

The several sets of findings which concern community origins and migration histories of the four classes of workers are obviously not independent of each other, and together they add up to a fairly consistent picture. The white-collar workers, and especially those in group A, were relatively likely to have migrated frequently over long distances and to have originated in large cities. The blue-collar workers were more likely to have originated on farms or in small towns near Raleigh or Burlington-Graham, and they had been less migratory than the white-collar workers. The blue-collar workers did not differ much from each other in community origins or migration histories, but the skilled manual workers (C) were slightly less migratory than the semiskilled and unskilled (D). As one would expect, the higher-status workers had received more education than the lower-status workers, and the higher-status workers tended to have come from higher-status backgrounds. The status level of a worker's father had some effect on the worker's occupational chances which was independent of the amount of education the worker received, though the worker's education exerted a far more powerful effect on his chances than his background did when the two were dissimilar.

INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY

Intergenerational mobility refers to the relative standing of a worker's occupation and that of his father. If a worker's occupation outranks that of his father, he has experienced upward intergenerational mobility; if his occupation ranks lower than that of his father, he has experienced downward intergenerational mobility; and if his and his fathers occupation are in the same status group, he has been intergenerationally stable.

It may be well to remind the reader of two limitations inherent in the kinds of statistics we will be presenting on mobility. One is that the amount of apparent mobility is an artifact of the occupational classification scheme one chooses to use. The larger the number of occupational categories used, the more mobility will appear to have taken place. Moreover, different occupational rating schemes will produce different amounts of apparent mobility even if they use the same number of categories, since they will classify some of the same jobs differently and employ different dividing points between categories.

The second limitation is that unless the sample is confined to workers past or near retirement, some mobility will be missed, since the workers may experience mobility after the study is made. This poses more difficulty in studying career mobility than in studying intergenerational mobility, since in studying intergenerational mobility the distortion can be minimized by matching the ages at which fathers' and sons' occupational standing is measured. The distortion is rather small in our own findings, since the fathers' occupations were measured as of the time when the sons were in their teens, and the sons when we interviewed them were, on the average, in their late thirties--only a few years younger than the average age of the fathers when the fathers' occupations were measured. This means that the individual distortions are probably compensatory and our figures on rates of mobility are probably fairly accurate. On the other hand, there is nothing we can do with our data to eliminate distortions in individual cases, and these will make any findings on the correlates of individual mobility appear less clear-cut than the relationships which exist in reality. These problems are common to studies of mobility, but fortunately they probably create very little error in figures on rates of mobility, and in figures on correlates of mobility their probable effect is to minimize the size of relationships somewhat though they do not change the direction of relationships.

Table 12 shows the relation between fathers' and sons' occupational standing. It is like Table 1 except that it uses the Hollingshead index (ISS) instead of the Census classification of occupations. Table 1 is therefore better for comparison with other studies but Table 12 more accurately reflects the amount of mobility since the Hollingshead index is more nearly an ordinal and non-overlapping scale of occupational standing.

In spite of the differences between the two classifications, the results of this second tabulation are essentially the same as those of the first. Workers were more likely to be intergenerationally mobile than stable, with those in level 5 (skilled) showing the highest rate of inheritance of occupational level (42 per cent) and those in level 2 (managers, medium-sized business proprietors, and lesser professionals) showing the lowest rate of inheritance (17 per cent). There was some tendency for mobility to occur mainly between adjacent status levels, a tendency which, as Rogoff notes in reviewing earlier studies, has commonly been found.[20] In only three of the seven status levels, however, did more than half the workers have fathers in the same or adjacent levels; these were levels 4, 5, and 6. Level 7 was represented by only 11 workers, and seven of these were downwardly mobile from levels 3, 4, and 5; it was of course not possible to be upwardly mobile into this

---

[20] Rogoff, op. cit., p. 23.

TABLE 13. Upward and Downward Mobility According to IOS Levels (N= 366)

IOS Level of Son's Occupation	Number and Per Cent Who Have							
	Moved Up		Remained		Moved Down		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Level 1 (High)	(40)	78.4	(11)	21.6	(—)	0.0	(51)	100.0
2	(37)	77.1	(8)	16.7	(3)	6.2	(48)	100.0
3	(43)	68.2	(14)	22.2	(6)	9.5	(63)	99.9
4	(42)	56.8	(16)	21.6	(16)	21.6	(74)	100.0
5	(19)	39.6	(20)	41.7	(9)	18.8	(48)	100.1
6	(10)	14.1	(26)	36.5	(35)	49.3	(71)	99.9
7 (Low)	(—)	0.0	(2)	18.2	(9)	81.8	(11)	100.0
Total	(191)	52.2	(97)	26.5	(78)	21.3	(366)	100.0

level. Half or more of the workers in levels 1, 2, and 3 had fathers whose occupations were two or more levels below their own; this pattern reflects the general upgrading of the occupational structure in recent decades.[21]

Tables 13 and 14 summarize figures from Tables 12 and 1, respectively, to show how many workers in each occupational class had been upwardly mobile, intergenerationally stable, and downwardly mobile. The first of these uses the Hollingshead classification. The second, using the Census classification, shows in parentheses the comparable figures from the 1947 nationwide survey.[22] Our Piedmont North Carolina figures (Table 14) show somewhat greater rates of mobility into the higher occupational levels than were found in the national sample, for reasons already noted when the same figures were given in Table 1. The Hollingshead classification (Table 13) results in the appearance of less upward mobility and more downwardly mobile and stable patterns than are shown in the figures based on the Census classification. This seeming difference stems entirely from the different method of classifying identical occupations: the Hollingshead classification places semi-professional

---

[21] As Rogoff (op. cit., p. 24) notes, no occupational classification scheme yet devised is an equal-interval scale. This being the case, there is a certain unreality in saying that workers move a certain distance, expressed in number of levels, along the scale. Nevertheless it often simplifies and clarifies analysis to act as if the scale were an interval scale, so long as no claim to precision is made and no statistical manipulations which assume an interval scale are made.

[22] The nationwide figures are adapted from Kahl, The American Class Structure, op. cit., p. 263, which in turn was an adaptation from National Opinion Research Center, op. cit.

TABLE 14. Upward and Downward Mobility: Comparative Percentages for NORC and Present Data (Census Classification)

	Comparative Percentages Who Have						
	Moved Up		Remained		Moved Down		Total
Occupation	NORC	Present Data	NORC	Present Data	NORC	Present Data	
Professional persons	(77)	86.6	(23)	13.4	(--)	---	100.0
Proprietors, managers, & officials, nonfarm	(65)	66.0	(31)	27.0	(4)	7.0	100.0
Clerks and salespeople	(53)	60.6	(15)	16.7	(32)	22.7	100.0
Skilled workers & foremen	(56)	59.2	(30)	28.6	(14)	12.2	100.0
Semiskilled & service workers	(43)	39.2	(19)	33.8	(38)	27.0	100.0
Unskilled workers, nonfarm	(--)	--	(27)	10.0	(73)	90.0	100.0

Source of NORC data: Kahl, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

TABLE 15. Work and Migratory History by Education, Intergenerational Mobility, and Status of Present Job for Selected Categories

	Education and Mobility Status			
	High School Graduate or More		Non-High School Graduate	
Work & Migratory History	High Upward % (climbers)	Low, Downward % (skidders)	High, Upward % (climbers)	Low, Downward % (skidders)
a. Time in Labor Force				
0-9 years	28.3	33.3	6.9	8.3
10-19 years	30.7	53.4	13.8	25.0
20 or more years	41.0	13.3	79.3	66.7
N	(127)	(15)	(29)	(36)
b. Number of Jobs				
1 job	18.5	13.3	—	8.3
2-3 jobs	56.1	46.7	34.5	63.9
4 or more jobs	25.4	40.0	65.5	27.8
N	(130)	(15)	(29)	(36)
c. Community Origin				
Metropolis	19.2	13.3	7.1	5.6
Town	57.7	46.7	67.9	36.1
Farm	23.1	40.0	25.0	58.3
N	(128)	(15)	(29)	(36)
d. Geographic Origin				
Present county	25.0	46.7	62.1	50.0
Other N. C.	36.7	46.7	20.7	30.6
Outside N. C.	38.3	6.7	17.2	19.4
N	(128)	(15)	(29)	(36)
e. Migration Within N. C.				
No moves during career	49.2	53.3	51.7	54.3
1 move	21.9	33.3	20.7	31.4
2 or more moves	28.9	13.3	27.6	14.3
N	(128)	(15)	(29)	(35)
f. Interstate Migration				
No moves during career	57.0	86.7	58.6	68.6
1 move	20.3	6.7	17.3	5.7
2 or more moves	22.7	6.7	24.1	25.7
N	(128)	(15)	(29)	(35)

workers, small businessmen, and clerical and sales workers in lower categories than the Census scheme does, thus having the apparent effect of downgrading these groups of workers and, in the present instance, reducing the amount of upward mobility. By any reasonable method of classifying occupations, however, it seems likely that more upward than downward mobility would be found to have occurred in recent years.

Table 15 classifies workers on the basis of educational attainment, present occupational status, and direction of intergenerational mobility (if any), and examines some aspects of the work and migration histories of some categories of workers thus obtained. After combining IOS levels A and B into a single "white collar" class and levels C and D into a single "blue collar" class, the full classification of workers would include 12 types: within each of two educational categories, high school graduates and non-high school graduates, there are white-collar and blue-collar workers, and within each of these groups, there are upwardly mobile, intergenerationally stable, and downwardly mobile workers.[23] To simplify the analysis for easier comprehension, the figures in Table 14 and the discussion below consider only four extreme types of workers: educated climbers, who had finished high school and had experienced upward intergenerational mobility into white-collar occupations, educated skidders,

---

[23] A worker was considered intergenerationally mobile if his IOS level was different from that of his father. Therefore there were downwardly mobile white-collar workers and upwardly mobile blue-collar workers. This definition is different from the one sometimes used, in which workers are considered mobile only when the movement takes them across the blue collar-white collar boundary.

TABLE 16. IOS Levels of First Jobs of Workers By Certain Characteristics of Their Origins

Characteristic	Per Cent of Workers Whose First Job Was in Each Level				
	Level A (High)	Level B	Level C	Level D (Low)	N=100%
a. Father's Occupation and Worker's Education					
Father A or B					
Worker h. s. grad.	36.4	40.9	3.0	19.7	132
Worker not h. s. grad.	0.0	27.8	8.3	63.9	36
Father C or D					
Worker h. s. grad.	6.2	38.1	6.2	49.5	97
Worker not h. s. grad.	0.0	6.4	7.4	86.2	94
b. Community Origin and Worker's Education					
Metropolis					
Worker h. s. grad.	32.6	54.3	0.0	13.0	46
Worker not h. s. grad.	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4	7
Town					
Worker h. s. grad.	19.5	40.6	6.0	33.8	133
Worker not h. s. grad.	0.0	15.7	4.3	80.0	70
Farm					
Worker h. s. grad	25.5	23.6	3.6	47.3	55
Worker not h. s. grad.	0.0	5.4	10.7	83.9	56

who had finished high school but had been downwardly mobile into blue-collar work, uneducated climbers, who had failed to finish high school but had nevertheless been upwardly mobile into white-collar occupations, and uneducated skidders, who had not finished high school and had experienced downward intergenerational mobility into blue-collar occupations.[24] The findings should be considered highly tentative, since the number of workers in some of the types, especially educated skidders, were small.

Time spent in the labor force. No surprises appear in the figures on time spent in the labor force by the four categories of workers, shown as Part a of Table 15. Both of the educated (high school graduate) groups had averaged fewer years in the labor force than the uneducated. This simply means that being younger, they had entered the labor force at a time when a larger proportion of students than before were finishing high school. Among both the educated and the uneducated, the climbers tended to have been in the labor force longer than the skidders. The finding reflects the common pattern in which a worker enters the labor force in a relatively low-ranking job, and moves up during his career. (A later section of this chapter will discuss career mobility.) Perhaps the most interesting findings regarding time spent in the labor force concern the two groups which were extreme in this respect. Eighty-seven per cent of the educated skidders had spent less than 20 years in the labor force; no doubt some of these would rise to higher positions, thus becoming intergenerationally stable or upwardly mobile, later in their careers. In contrast, nearly 80 per cent of the uneducated climbers had been working for 20 years or longer; apparently gradual upward movement during their careers was necessary before these men without high school diplomas could achieve high status.

---

[24] The term "skidder" is from Harold Wilensky and Hugh Edwards, "The Skidder: Ideological Adjustments of Downward Mobile Workers," American Sociological Review, 24 (1959), pp. 215-231. Tabulations and interpretations concerning some of the types of workers left out of Table 15 and the discussion of it are available on request from Richard L. Simpson at the Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Number of jobs held. The findings on numbers of jobs held by the four groups of workers provide some contrasts with those just given, on length of time spent in the labor force, in spite of the natural tendency for number of jobs held and time spent in the labor force to be related. The educated climbers had held the smallest average number of jobs, although they had spent more time in the labor force than the educated skidders. The reason for this discrepancy is that the educated climbers included a higher proportion of highly educated, professional and higher managerial workers, and this type of worker is likely to step directly from college into a high-ranking job which he does not have to abandon in order to reach high status. It is risky to generalize from findings on only 15 educated skidders, but these seem to have included a sizable number of workers who had drifted aimlessly from one job to another, thus accumulating lengthy job histories despite having spent relatively few years in the labor force. From the findings on both of these groups of educated workers, the climbers and the skidders, one might hazard the hypothesis that a worker who receives an education through high school or beyond is likely either to step almost immediately into a high-ranking job, or to drift without achieving high status at least until well into middle age.

Among the uneducated, the climbers had averaged more jobs than the skidders. The climbers had also spent more time in the labor force, but the difference in this respect was smaller than the difference in number of jobs held. One might interpret this to mean that only through repeated job changes, each representing a slight step up, is an uneducated worker likely to reach high status. Findings to be presented later, on career mobility, lend some support to this interpretation.

Community origin. The only group of workers in which a majority had been reared on farms were the uneducated skidders, and in fact, these were the only group among the entire 12 who were predominantly of farm origin. This uneducated skidder group included a number of workers who were the sons of farm owners and had slipped down into the semiskilled or unskilled class during the 1930's and stayed there. Forty per cent (six) of the educated skidders were also from farms; but these were much younger, on the average, and it seems likely that some of them were destined to rise to higher occupational levels later in their careers. Only one-fourth of the uneducated climbers and fewer than one-fourth of the educated climbers were of farm background.

No other striking differences in community origin were found. Metropolitan origins were more prevalent among the educated than among the uneducated, and more prevalent among climbers than among skidders. The advantage held by city-bred workers in urban labor market competition has already been noted.

Geographic origin and migration. Parts d, e, and f of Table 15 show geographic origins and migration histories of the four types of workers. The heaviest concentration of workers who had been reared outside North Carolina was among the educated climbers, 38 per cent of whom had grown up in other states. This finding is not independent of the previous finding that the educated climbers included more workers of metropolitan origin than the other three groups, but twice as many educated climbers were from other states as were from metropolitan areas either inside or outside North Carolina. This high frequency of out-of-state origin can probably be explained by the wide scale of high-status labor markets, commented on earlier; recruitment for high-ranking professional and managerial positions is not limited to the immediate areas where the positions are located.

At the opposite extreme in prevalence of out-of-state origins were the educated skidders. Of 15 in this group, only one had originated in a state other than North Carolina; the remaining 14 were equally divided between workers who had originated in the county of current residence (Wake or Alamance) and workers from other parts of North Carolina. It has been pointed out earlier that these downwardly mobile high school graduates had held numerous jobs, considering the relatively short times they had spent in the labor force. It seems that their frequent job changes had been mainly confined to North Carolina, as one might expect in view of the primarily local nature of blue-collar job recruiting in the South.

Workers in the two uneducated groups were more likely to have come from outside the state than educated skidders were, but they were also more likely to have originated in the county of current residence. This was especially true of the uneducated climbers, 62 per cent of whom had grown up in the counties where they currently worked. The prevalence of local origins among uneducated climbers is especially striking when we recall that they tended to have been in the labor force longer and to have held more jobs than any other group of workers. They appear to have been a steady, tenacious group who tended to stay in the same labor market area or return home after leaving temporarily, switching jobs relatively often to advance to white-collar status in spite of their lack of high school diplomas.

In frequency of migration within North Carolina and across state lines, the differences among the four groups were slight--less than their differences in other respects. The frequency of within-state moves was almost the same in every group, except that skidders were less likely than climbers to have made two or more moves, whether or not they had finished high school. The small number of within-state moves by educated skidders is understandable in view of their youth, but the uneducated skidders seem to have been remarkably sedentary; fewer than half of them had ever migrated within the state since entering the the labor force, although two-thirds of them had been in the labor force more than 20 years. The uneducated skidders, it will be recalled, included a large number whose fathers owned farms but who themselves slipped into semiskilled or unskilled work in town. They appear to have been victims of the depression who never recovered from it.

The patterns of interstate migration were somewhat different from the patterns of within-state migration. More than half the workers in each of the four groups had spent their entire working lives in North Carolina, but the skidders were even more likely to have done so than the climbers. The climbers' greater frequency of interstate moves is partly a reflection of the greater lengths of time they tended to have spent in the labor force, within each educational class, and partly a reflection of the greater geographic scale of white-collar than of blue-collar recruiting patterns.

It might appear paradoxical that 87 per cent (13 of 15) of the educated skidders had made no interstate moves during their working lives, even though these workers were less likely than either of the uneducated groups to have originated in the county of current residence. These educated skidders also ranked somewhat below average in frequency of moves within the state. To add to the seeming paradox, they averaged more total jobs held than any other group except the uneducated climbers. Thus we have a group who had held many jobs in a short time, and who had made relatively few moves despite being mainly of non-local origin. This seems to add up to a pattern of migration from home in order to accept a first job, followed by a tendency to drift between jobs but without long-distance migration. It may be well to repeat that there were only 15 educated skidders in our sample, so that the generalizability of these interpretations is open to question.

The uneducated climbers, whom we have previously portrayed as a steady, tenacious, ambitious group, presented somewhat the reverse of this pattern. Relatively few of them (59 per cent) had failed to migrate across state lines since entering the labor force, although relatively many (62 per cent) had originated in the county of current residence. This might also appear paradoxical, but what it seems to suggest is that a number of these uneducated climbers had moved far from home at some time during their careers but had returned home.

In much of this discussion of workers classified according to intergenerational mobility, the interpretation has hinged upon assumed relationships between intergenerational mobility and mobility of the individual during his career. It is difficult to discuss one type of mobility without reference to the other, and indeed it would probably be a mistake to try. A later section of this chapter will discuss findings on career mobility and lend support to some of the interpretations made in this section.

Let us now summarize some of these findings on intergenerational mobility by constructing rough modal profiles of the four groups of workers representing extreme patterns of intergenerational mobility.

The educated climber. This worker was defined as one who had received at least a full high school education and who held a white-collar job which outranked his father's occupation. He was likely to have spent less time in the labor force than the average uneducated worker, but more time than the educated skidder; this would not necessarily make him younger than the uneducated worker, however, since he had entered the labor force late after staying in school longer than most other workers. He was more likely than any other worker to have held only one job and was relatively unlikely to have held four or more jobs. In comparison with other workers he was relatively likely to have originated in a metropolitan area, although even in this group, fewer than one-fifth of all workers had originated in cities of more than 50,000 population. He was not as likely as other workers to have been reared on a farm. He was much more likely than the other three types of workers to have originated outside his current county and state of residence, and somewhat more likely to have made frequent moves within North Carolina and across state lines. This category of workers was the largest in the sample, comprising 130 of the 380 workers studied.

The educated skidder. Educated skidders were defined as workers who had completed high school but had suffered downward intergenerational mobility into blue-collar jobs. Only 15 workers among the 380 were in this category; this is not surprising in view of their having high school diplomas, which usually assure workers of white-collar status or at least skilled blue-collar status and thus make downward mobility unlikely, but the smallness of this group makes interpretation hazardous and tentative. The worker in this category tended to be a relative newcomer to the labor force, and thus might have a good chance to rise above his current low estate. This optimism is tempered, however, by the fact that he had already held a larger than average number of jobs, without, apparently, advancing his fortunes much. The modal patterns of origin and migration among educated skidders included town or farm origin within North Carolina and relatively little migration, especially interstate moves. It thus appears that the typical educated skidder had switched jobs often but had not migrated frequently.

The uneducated climber. Uneducated climbers were defined as workers who had not graduated from high school but had experienced upward intergenerational mobility into white-collar jobs. The typical worker in this category, which included 29 of the 380, had been in the labor force longer than the average worker in any other category, a fact which is not surprising since only through career mobility could he achieve high status despite disadvantages of education and family background. Similarly, he tended to have held more jobs than any other worker. He was relatively likely to be of local origin but with a probability of having lived elsewhere temporarily before returning home.

The uneducated skidder. Defined as downwardly mobile blue-collar workers without high school diplomas, uneducated skidders included 36 of the 380 workers. The uneducated skidder was likely to have spent nearly as many years in the labor force as the uneducated climber, and more years than either of the two educated groups. Despite this, he was considerably less likely than the educated skidder to have held a large number of jobs during his working life. Together, these two findings present a picture of long tenure in a small number of low-ranking positions. This was the only group in which a majority of workers had originated on farms, and only the uneducated climbers were more likely to have been reared in the county of current residence. Finally, the uneducated skidder was somewhat below average in frequency of intrastate and interstate migration. This group included a substantial number of farm owners' sons who suffered downward integenerational mobility because they entered the labor market during the depression of the 1930's. Having slipped down, however, their tendency was to make a relatively stable adjustment at the lower end of the occupational hierarchy. In this respect they differed markedly from the skidders with high school diplomas, a younger group which included a larger percentage of frequent job changers.

FACTORS RELATED TO FIRST JOB

The first job a man takes when he enters the full-time labor force may set the pattern for his whole career. It is difficult to escape a low-level job, especially without a complete high school education, and college graduates usually start at high levels and stay there, thus preempting many of the most desirable positions. Since the first job helps to determine later jobs, one would expect to find essentially the same relationships between men's first jobs and their background characteristics as were found between their present jobs and background characteristics. A comparison of Table 16, which gives certain background characteristics of workers whose first jobs were at different IOS levels, with Tables 4 and 7, which related background characteristics to current job levels, bears out this expectation in general--but with some interesting differences which will be commented on below. The relationships between first jobs and subsequent career patterns will be the subject of the next section of this chapter, on career mobility.

Education and family background. The same general pattern prevailed as the one noted earlier in connection with the level of present

TABLE 17. Census Levels of First and Present Occupations (N= 374)

Present Occupation	N	Per Cent Whose First Jobs Were: Profes-sionals	Mana-gers	Clerical & Sales	Skilled	Semiskilled & Service	Farm	Unskilled	Total
Professional persons	85	61.2	4.7	16.5	3.5	7.0	1.2	5.9	100.0
Proprietors, managers & officials, nonfarm	88	10.2	14.8	31.8	3.4	28.4	5.7	5.7	100.0
Clerks & salespeople	65	7.7	3.1	44.6	3.1	32.3	1.5	7.7	100.0
Skilled workers & foremen	51	---	--	9.8	17.6	54.9	5.9	11.8	100.0
Semiskilled & service workers	74	--	1.4	8.1	2.7	54.0	16.2	17.6	100.0
Unskilled workers, nonfarm	11	--	--	9.1	--	36.4	--	54.5	100.0
Total	(374)	17.6	5.3	22.2	5.1	32.9	5.9	11.0	100.0

. (Compare Part a of Table 16 with Table 4.) Both the worker's education and his father's occupational status were related in the expected manner to his first job, but his own education was more important than his father's occupation when one of these was high and the other was low. Of the workers who had graduated from high school 36 per cent of those with high-status fathers but only 6 per cent of those with low-status fathers had begun their careers in IOS level A; 77 per cent with high-status fathers but only 44 per cent with low-status fathers had begun in white-collar jobs (levels A and B combined); and fewer than 20 per cent with high-status fathers but nearly half those with low-status fathers had begun in the bottom level, D.

Even more convincing are the findings on first jobs of workers without high school diplomas.[25] Of these uneducated workers, 28 per cent with high-status fathers but only 6 per cent with low-status fathers begun their careers in white-collar occupations, and at the other extreme, 86 per cent with low-status fathers but only 64 per cent with high-status fathers had started in the lowest job level, D. Again it appears that low parental status sometimes held back both educated and uneducated sons. This finding corresponds to the Oakland, California finding reported by Lipset, Malm, and Bendix.[26]

---

[25] For the methodological reason for the superiority of findings on uneducated workers for a test of the hypothesis that father's status affects son's chances independently of son's education, see footnote 15, above.

[26] S. M. Lipset and F. Theodore Malm, "First Jobs and Career Plans," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 14 (1955), pp. 247-261; Lipset

Only 20 of the 380 workers (20 of 359 and 367, the total N's in the two parts of Table 16) began their careers in level C, which is composed mainly of skilled craftsmen. As is also suggested in other findings, including some of the tabulations left out of Table 15 for the sake of simplicity, it usually takes time to work up to this level from the semiskilled and unskilled ranks below. The numbers of workers involved are rather small, but it is consistent with the findings just presented that among the workers who began their careers in blue-collar jobs, those with high-status fathers (among both the graduates and non-graduates of high school) and those with high school diplomas (among both parental-status groups) were the more likely to begin in skilled rather than in semiskilled or unskilled work. (This can be seen by comparing the percentages of workers who had begun in level C and in level D within each social background category.) Thus even within the blue-collar group considered separately, both the education of a worker and the status of his father's occupation appeared to have an effect on his career chances.

Community origin. The effects of education and community origin on first jobs differed in an interesting way from their effects on present jobs. It was shown earlier (Table 7) that farm-reared workers were

---

and Bendix, op. cit., pp. 190-192. Their analysis suffers from the same defect as ours, that of lumping together in the same category respondents who differed in exact number of years of schooling and thus rendering the control on education imperfect. Their figures given in Table 7.5, p. 192 of the Lipset and Bendix volume cannot be directly compared with ours, since they use a different breaking point between educational categories.

at a disadvantage compared with workers from towns, so far as their current jobs were concerned, only if they lacked high school diplomas; among the high school graduates, the farm-reared were about as likely as the town-reared (but not the metropolis-reared) to hold white-collar jobs when interviewed. In contrast to this, Part b of Table 16 shows that workers from farms were more likely than workers from either towns or metropolitan areas to have begun their careers in low-ranking jobs--and this was true of both graduates and non-graduates of high schools. Among the high school graduates, 47 per cent of the farm-reared but only 34 per cent of the town-reared and 13 per cent of the metropolis-reared had begun their careers in level-D jobs; 51 per cent of the high school graduates from farms but only 40 per cent from towns and 13 per cent from metropolitan areas had begun in some kind of blue-collar work. Similar though less sharp differences prevailed between the farm-reared and town-reared non-high school graduates. (There were too few metropolitan non-high school graduates to allow safe interpretation about this group.) Thus we find that, with high school education, a farm-reared worker was as likely as a town-reared worker to hold a high-ranking job when interviewed, even though he was less likely to have begun his career in a high ranking job.

From this last finding it seems evident that the farm-reared high school graduates were more likely than the town-reared to have moved up in status during their work careers. One should hesitate to draw far-reaching conclusions from this finding, since the size of the sample did not allow control on some other variables which might help to explain the relationships found. Bearing the need for caution in mind, however, this finding that the farm-reared were more likely than the town-reared to achieve upward career mobility is reminiscent of earlier studies by Whyte[27] and Dalton.[28] They found in studying the work habits and attitudes of industrial workers that the farm-reared were more likely than workers of urban background to be imbued with ambition, respect for superiors, the belief in hard work, and other elements of Protestant ethic. All of these would seem to be qualities which would help a worker rise to a higher-ranking job.

Nearly all (87 per cent) of the high school graduates from metropolitan areas had begun their careers in white-collar work. This educated metropolitan group included over 27 per cent (15 of 55) of all workers who had started in level-A jobs, although they made up less than 13 per cent (46 of 367) of the total sample for this tabulation. (These latter percentages and N's are obtained vertically and are not shown in the table, which runs horizontally.) These seem to have been a rather special group of workers. They included many who had been to college and migrated long distances to take jobs at the upper ends of the occupational pyramids in Burlington-Graham and Raleigh.

None of these figures, unfortunately, can be considered representative of the community origins of workers whose first jobs were located in the two communities we studied, since many of the first jobs in our tabulations were held elsewhere. Our sample represents workers currently employed in these two cities in the summer of 1959, not workers who grew up or first entered the labor force there.

---

[27] W. F. Whyte, "Who Goes Union and Why," Personal Journal, 23 (1944), pp. 215-230.

[28] Melville Dalton, "The Industrial Rate Buster," Human Organization, 7: 1 (1948), pp. 5-18.

CAREER MOBILITY

Career mobility refers to the relative standing of the workers' first and subsequent occupational statuses. A worker whose current occupation is at a higher level than his first occupation has experienced upward career mobility, a worker whose current occupation is at a lower level than his first occupation has experienced downward career mobility, and a worker whose first and current positions have been at the same level--whether or not he has changed jobs--has been stable. Tables 17 through 22 give information on career mobility and variables related to it. Looking first at Tables 17 and 18, we see the gross relationships between first and current jobs, according to the Census occupational categories (Table 17) and the Hollingshead Indes of Occupational Status categories (Table 18). The pattern is not unlike the one shown earlier in Tables 1 and 12, on intergenerational mobility: there was some tendency toward stability as opposed to movement, and there was more upward than downward mobility.

By either the Census or the Hollingshead measure, it appears that workers currently at the extremes, in high- or low-ranking occupations, were the most likely to have had stable careers, while workers who started in the middle-ranking occupations were more likely to have moved. By the

TABLE 18. IOS Levels of First and Present Occupations (N=374)

IOS Level of Present Job	N	Per Cent Whose First Jobs Were on Level							
		1 (High)	2	3	4	5	6	7(Low)	Total
Level 1 (High)	(53)	54.7	15.1	9.4	15.1	1.9	3.8	0.0	100.0
2	(48)	2.1	27.1	18.8	37.5	4.2	8.3	2.1	100.1
3	(66)	1.5	3.0	12.1	33.3	4.5	37.9	7.6	99.9
4	(74)	1.4	1.4	4.0	36.5	4.0	39.2	13.5	100.0
5	(50)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	18.0	52.0	22.0	100.0
6	(71)	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	2.8	60.6	26.8	100.0
7	(12)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	41.7	50.0	100.0
Total	(374)	8.6	6.4	6.7	23.3	5.3	35.8	13.9	100.0

TABLE 19. Upward and Downward Mobility Based on Census Occupational Classification (N= 374)

Present Occupation	N	Percentages Who Have Moved Up	Remained	Moved Down	Total
Professional persons	85	38.8	61.2	--	100.0
Proprietors, managers, & officials, nonfarm	88	75.0	14.8	10.2	100.0
Clerks and salespeople	65	44.6	44.6	10.8	100.0
Skilled workers & foremen	51	72.6	17.6	9.8	100.0
Semiskilled & service workers	74	33.8	54.0	12.2	100.0
Unskilled workers, nonfarm	11	--	54.6	45.4	100.0
Total	(374)	50.8	39.8	9.4	100.0

Census measure (Table 17) 61 per cent of the current professionals, 54 per cent of the operatives and service workers, and 55 per cent of the unskilled laborers had begun their careers at these same occupational levels. (The figures for unskilled laborers are not very trustworthy, however, since the sample included only 11 of these.) Workers who were in the middle Census ranks at the time of the study--managers and officials, clerical and sales workers, and skilled manual workers--were less likely to have been stable and more likely to have moved up during their careers into their current occupations. This does not mean that unskilled, semiskilled, or service work is a dead end. Many workers whose first jobs had been in these low-ranking fields had moved up into higher-ranking occupations. What it does mean is that of the workers currently employed in these jobs (and in the professions), relatively few had been mobile during their careers. Table 18, using the Hollingshead index, leads to a similar conclusion, as will be indicated in more detail below.

Natalie Rogoff, summarizing a variety of studies, states that "studies in career mobility have generally found that no more than 50 per cent of the population moves out of the occupational class in which the first position was held."[29] Our findings shown in Tables 17 and 18 indicate that this was not entirely true of our North Carolina Piedmont workers, and this is brought out more clearly in Tables 19 and 20, which summarize the more detailed information from Tables 17 and 18.[30] Most

---

[29] Rogoff, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

[30] Goldstein's study of Norristown, Pennsylvania gives related but not directly comparable data. He reports: "Of the sample population of

TABLE 20. Upward and Downward Mobility Based on IOS
(N= 374)

IOS Level of Present Job		Percentages Who Have			
	N	Moved Up	Remained	Moved Down	Total
Level 1 (High)	53	45.3	54.7	--	100.0
2	48	70.8	27.1	2.1	100.0
3	66	83.3	12.1	4.5	99.9
4	74	56.8	36.5	6.8	100.1
5	50	74.0	18.0	8.0	100.0
6	71	26.8	60.6	12.7	100.1
7 (Low)	12	--	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	(374)	56.4	36.1	7.5	100.0

workers currently holding positions classified by the Census (Table 19) as "managers, proprietors, and officials" and "skilled craftsmen and foremen" had been upwardly mobile during their careers into these positions; only 15 per cent of the managers and 18 per cent of the craftsmen had begun their careers in these job categories and remained (or returned) there. Rogoff's statement may be true of professionals, operatives and service workers, and laborers in our sample, more than half of whom had been stable, and approximately true of clerical and sales workers, nearly half of whom had been stable; but even in these groups, some workers would doubtless move into different occupational levels later in their careers. It is of interest that the only occupational groups in which

---

the 1910-1920 decade, 75.9 per cent were in the same [Census] occupational group at the beginning and at the end of the decade. The stability rates in the three following decades were 71.4, 65.9, and 65.1, respectively." (Sidney Goldstein, Patterns of Mobility, 1910-1950: The Norristown Study, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1958, p. 190.) Goldstein discusses these same data in "Migration and Occupational Mobility in Norristown," American Sociological Review, 20 (August 1955), pp. 402-408. We have no comparable figures for mobility by decades, but we do have data (the N's used for Part a of Table 22, below) which show that the workers still in the same IOS (not Census) levels where they began included 67.9 per cent of those in the labor force less than 10 years, 54.2 per cent of those in the labor force more than 10 but less than 20 years, and 59.7 per cent of both of these groups combined. These figures are based on the IOS, but we also know that IOS tabulations give the appearance of more job stability (less mobility) than Census tabulations do. (Compare Table 19 with 20 and 13 with 14.) Therefore the rates of stability among our workers in the labor force less than 20 years would be lower than the figures given above if we had computed them from Census occupational classes. From this is seems reasonably safe to conclude that there has been more career mobility in Burlington-Graham and Raleigh than in Norristown, even allowing for a continuation through 1960 of the drop in Norristown's stability rates which Goldstein found for succeeding decades from 1910 to 1950. This interpretation assumes that career mobility is no less likely to occur in a worker's first 20 years in the labor force than thereafter.

most of the current workers had been upwardly mobile were the managerial and craft groups, neither of which is characterized by formal educational requirements for entry.

Our data also fail to fit Rogoff's generalization when the occupations are classified by the Hollingshead scheme, as is done in Table 20. More than half the workers in the highest and the two lowest current job levels--1, 6, and 7--had been stable, but more than half the workers currently in the middle levels--2, 3, 4, and 5--had been upwardly mobile into these levels during their careers. Arnold Green seems to be right when he says that "mobility occurs most frequently at the middle,"[31] if by mobility we mean career mobility--but not if we mean intergenerational mobility, which was the prevailing pattern at all levels (Tables 13 and 14).

Thus it appears that North Carolina Piedmont workers have experienced more career mobility than the workers described in previous research conducted elsewhere, although their rates of intergenerational mobility appear very similar to those found in other places. This would mean that they have begun lower but climbed farther to reach the same destination. The main direction of movement, as elsewhere, has been upward; downward mobility was rare, by either the Census or Hollingshead measures, except among workers currently in the bottom stratum.

---

[31] Arnold W. Green, Sociology, 3rd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill 1960, p. 211.

Table 21 shows, for workers currently in each of the four main levels derived from the IOS scheme, the ages at which they took their first full-time jobs and the total numbers of jobs they had held.

Part a shows that the higher was the current occupational status, the older the worker was likely to have been when he entered the labor force. This simply reflects the fact that the more education a man receives, the later he will enter the labor force and the higher the occupational status he will probably achieve.

From Part b of Table 21, some inferences can be drawn concerning the career sequences likely to lead into positions at the various levels. The higher the current occupation, the larger the percentage of workers who had held only one job: the percentages holding only one job were 18, 11, 10, and 7 for workers currently in levels A, B, C, and D. respectively. The relatively high percentage of level-A workers who had held only one, two, or three jobs is especially noteworthy in view of the fact that they tended to be older than the other workers. What this means is that the professional and managerial workers were often able to move directly into high-ranking positions as soon as they finished their education; they did not need to change jobs, or at least not often, in order to reach high status. Only a third of the level-A workers but slightly more than half in the other three groups had held four or more jobs; groups B, C, and D were almost identical in this regard.

Table 22 classifies workers on the basis of educational attainment, present occupational status, and direction of career mobility (if any), and examines some aspects of the work and migration histories of some

TABLE 21. Age of Entry Into Labor Force and Number of Jobs Held By Workers in Four IOS Levels

Age of Entry and Number of Jobs	Status of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a. Age First Job Taken								
Under 16 years	(3)	3.0	(12)	8.6	(10)	20.0	(20)	23.8
16-19 years	(17)	17.0	(83)	59.3	(26)	52.0	(46)	54.8
20-24	(49)	49.0	(37)	26.4	(14)	28.0	(16)	19.0
25 or older	(31)	31.0	(8)	5.7	(--)	0.0	(2)	2.4
Total	(100)	100.0	(140)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(84)	100.0
b. Number of Jobs Ever Held								
Only one job	(18)	18.0	(16)	11.4	(5)	10.0	(6)	7.2
2-3 jobs	(49)	49.0	(50)	35.7	(19)	38.0	(34)	41.0
4-5 jobs	(21)	21.0	(44)	31.4	(17)	34.0	(24)	28.9
6 or more jobs	(12)	12.0	(30)	21.4	(9)	18.0	(19)	22.9
Total	(100)	100.0	(140)	99.9	(50)	100.0	(83)	100.0

TABLE 22. Work and Migration History By Education, Career Mobility, and Status of Present Job for Selected Categories

	Career Mobility Status of Workers With						
	High School Graduation or More			Less Than High School Graduation			
	High Status		Low Status	High Status	Low Status		
	Upward %	Stable %	Stable %	Upward %	Up-ward %	Stable %	Down-ward %
a. Time in Labor Force							
0-9 years	18.8	47.8	27.8	2.9	13.1	12.8	0.0
10-19 years	36.8	17.4	50.0	14.2	21.7	38.5	27.3
20 or more years	44.4	34.8	22.2	82.9	65.2	48.7	72.7
N	(117)	(69)	(18)	(35)	(46)	(39)	(11)
b. Number of Jobs							
1 job	0.0	46.5	27.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
2-3	67.5	38.0	33.3	45.7	60.9	64.1	63.6
4 or more jobs	32.5	15.5	38.9	54.3	39.1	20.5	36.4
N	(117)	(71)*	(18)	(35)	(46)	(39)	(11)
c. Community Origin							
Metropolis	18.8	28.6	5.6	8.8	4.3	5.1	0.0
Town	58.1	51.4	55.5	58.8	45.7	48.7	45.5
Farm	23.1	20.0	38.9	32.4	50.0	46.2	54.5
N	(117)	(70)	(18)	(34)	(46)	(39)	(11)

---

* N's vary with number of residual responses, excluded here. Original total N was 380; grand totals here number between 365 and 367.

TABLE 22. Work and Migration History By Education, Career Mobility, and Status of Present Job for Selected Categories (Continued)

	Career Mobility Status of Workers With						
	High School Graduation or More			Less Than High School Graduation			
	High Status		Low Status	High Status	Low Status		
	Upward %	Stable %	Stable %	Upward %	Up-ward %	Stable %	Down-ward %
d. Geographic Origin							
Present county	25.6	22.5	58.8	57.1	52.2	48.7	45.4
Other N. C.	43.6	40.9	41.2	25.7	37.0	33.3	27.3
Outside N. C.	30.8	36.6	0.0	17.2	10.8	18.0	27.3
N	(117)	(71)	(17)	(35)	(46)	(39)	(11)
e. Intrastate Migration							
No moves	40.5	57.7	61.1	62.9	67.4	76.9	---
1 move	20.7	29.6	33.3	17.1	8.7	10.3	---
2 or more moves	38.8	12.7	5.5	20.0	23.9	12.8	---
N	(116)	(71)	(18)	(35)	(46)	(39)	(10)
f. Interstate Migration							
No moves	52.6	60.6	88.9	62.9	67.4	76.9	---
1 move	23.2	16.9	0.0	17.1	8.7	10.3	---
2 or more moves	24.1	22.5	11.1	20.0	23.9	12.8	---
N	(116)	(71)	(18)	(35)	(46)	(39)	(10)

categories of workers thus obtained. After combining IOS levels A and B into a single "white collar" class and levels C and D into a single "blue collar" class, the full classification of workers would include 12 types. Within each of two educational categories, high school graduates and non-high school graduates, there are white-collar and blue-collar workers, and within each of these groups, there are upwardly mobile, stable, and downwardly mobile workers. Five of the 12 possible types of workers were represented by so few cases (10 or fewer) that tabulations concerning them would mean little and are omitted for that reason. The discussion below will concern the occupational and migration histories of the seven remaining types of workers. It is not feasible to separate out for consideration the same four types as were considered in the discussion of intergenerational mobility, since there were very few career skidders.[32]

Time spent in the labor force. As Part a of Table 22 shows, the white-collar workers tended to have been in the labor force for shorter periods of time than the blue-collar workers; they were not necessarily younger but they had stayed in school longer before taking their first jobs. Among the white-collar high school graduates, the stable tended to have spent less time in the labor force than the upwardly mobile; this suggests that many of these would eventually rise into higher-ranking jobs than they currently held, and that career mobility often takes a long time even with considerable education.

---

[32] With a far larger sample than ours, it would be desirable to differentiate workers on the basis of how many steps their intergenerational and career mobility involved. Our mobility categories have the weakness of lumping together workers who have barely crept over the lines between adjacent status levels, and those who have made sharp ascents or descents. Workers at some status levels, especially those in the upper groups and at the very bottom, tended to have been "more mobile" in number of steps moved as well as in the likelihood of having been mobile at all in the sense of intergenerational mobility, and some differences of this kind also appear in the figures on career mobility. The differences were rather small, however, and the concealment of them in our method of classifying mobility types in Tables 15 and 22 does not seem likely to be misleading.

Among the 39 workers who held white-collar jobs despite having failed to graduate from high school, 35 had experienced upward career mobility, only 4 had been stable, and none had been downwardly mobile. This finding repeats what was earlier shown in Table 16, that men do not usually begin their work careers at the white-collar level if they lack high school diplomas. The uneducated worker is not likely to achieve white-collar status without a long climb upward from the blue-collar ranks; thus of the 35 upwardly mobile white-collar workers who had not finished high school, 83 per cent--the largest percentage in any group--had been in the labor force longer than 20 years. Only one of these 35 workers had spent less than 10 years in the labor force. That these "uneducated career climbers" were mainly older men may also mean that the requirements for entry into white-collar work have stiffened so that the success of these uneducated workers may be increasingly hard to duplicate in the future.[33]

---

[33] It is also possible that the rising rate of high school graduation--documented in our sample by the small percentage of non-graduates among the workers who had spent less than 10 years in the labor force--means that today's school drop-outs include a shrinking percentage of men with the ambition and aptitude needed for upward career mobility. Where

Number of jobs held. We have just seen that the uneducated career climbers had been working for a longer time than the educated climbers. The less educated had also changed jobs more often enroute to their white-collar positions. Comparing these two groups of climbers--the upwardly mobile white-collar workers with and without high school diplomas--we find that 54 per cent of the uneducated but fewer than a third of the educated had held four or more jobs. This is what we would expect in view of their longer lengths of time in the labor force, but it further documents the picture of the long, hard climb needed to reach white-collar status without a high school diploma.

A comparison of the three groups within which some workers had held only one job--all of them, by definition, stable--shows substantial differences in the percentages of workers in the three groups who had held only one job. Among these stable workers, 47 per cent of the educated white-collar workers, 28 per cent of the educated blue-collar workers, and only 15 per cent of the uneducated blue-collar workers had held only one job throughout their careers. These figures are almost directly parallel to the differences in these three groups in length of time spent in the labor force, and the coincidence suggests that very few workers in a modern community stay in one job throughout their careers. If more than a few

---

graduation from high school is the norm, those who fail to graduate may be different sorts of people than where graduation is the exception. Research now being conducted by Charles E. Bowerman and Ernest Q. Campbell of the University of North Carolina on the relation of aspiration levels to educational performance in Southern high schools may shed some light on this matter.

workers stayed in one job from entering the labor force until retirement, the correspondence would not have been so great between our figures for one-job-holders and for short-time labor force participants. It may well be that most lifetime one-job-holders are actually members of the traditional liberal professions, such as medicine and law, who enter independent practice as soon as they finish their education and to whose occupations the concept of "job" does not really apply.[34]

Community origin. Part *c* of Table 22 repeats the finding reported earlier, that highly educated white-collar workers were rather likely to have originated in metropolitan areas. Within this elite group, the stable were more likely than the upwardly mobile to be of metropolitan origin: 29 per cent of the stable as opposed to 19 per cent of the upwardly mobile were from metropolitan areas. This suggests that in a middle-sized Southern city like the ones we studied, many of the high-status workers with metropolitan origins are men whose family backgrounds were high and who began their careers at fairly high levels; having begun high, they appear as stable rather than upwardly mobile despite their current high status. This interpretation is consistent with one of the findings left out of Table 15, on intergenerational mobility: high-status workers who had originated in metropolitan areas were more often intergenerationally stable, and less often upwardly mobile, than high-status workers from towns smaller than 50,000. Communities like Burlington-Graham and Raleigh seem to attract a number of high-status workers from comfortable metropolitan backgrounds, often from outside the region, though they do not attract many manual workers from metropolitan areas or from anywhere outside the South. As was hypothesized earlier, the South appears to be less different from the rest of the nation in the high-status job market than in the low-status job market--manual workers gravitate away from the South toward the big Eastern and Midwestern cities, but managerial and professional workers are apt to move either to or from the South.

---

[34] Sidney Goldstein, *Patterns of Mobility, 1910-1950*, *op. cit.*, p. 192, and "Migration and Occupational Mobility in Norristown," *op. cit.*, p. 406, reports that "in each decade, professionals, managers, and skilled laborers, in that order, consistently represented the most stable occupations."

Geographic origin. The findings on geographic origin (Part d of Table 22) bear out the picture shown in the findings on community origin. The two groups with high education and high status shown in the table--mobile and stable-- stood out in their comparative absence of local origin, and the stable were less often local in origin than the upwardly mobile.

Among the three groups of uneducated blue-collar workers, the upwardly mobile were the most likely to have originated in the present county and the least likely to have originated outside North Carolina; in contrast, the downwardly mobile were the least likely to have originated locally and the most likely to have come from another state; the stable were intermediate in these respects. Caution is needed in interpreting these figures, since the downwardly mobile group of uneducated blue-collar workers constituted only 11 of the workers in the sample. The data seem to suggest, however, that the uneducated workers who come from afar into these Piedmont North Carolina communities do poorly in competition with the locally reared.

If so, they are different in this respect from those who come from outside the state with high educational attainment, for these do quite well in competition with the locally reared. There seem to be a group of poorly educated, occupationally unsuccessful "drifters" in towns such as these, who fare less well than the workers who drop out of school but stay in their home towns. A hypothesis worth exploring in the future might be the following: a worker in the South who drops out of high school will have some more occupational success if he stays home than if he leaves town, unless he moves to a northern city where wages are better than in the South. Our data barely suggest this hypothesis; they do not confirm it. To confirm any such hypothesis would require comparative data on the occupational structures and mobility-migration patterns at the points of origin and destination of workers over large areas.

Migration within North Carolina. In comparing the two educated white-collar groups (Part e of Table 22) a striking difference appears. Among these elite workers, the upwardly mobile were much more likely than the stable to have made two or more movew within North Carolina during their careers. Thirty-nine per cent of the upwardly mobile but only 13 per cent of the stable had moved twice or more within the state. Similarly, 41 per cent of the upwardly mobile but 58 per cent of the stable, within the elite group, had never moved from one place to another within North Carolina. Part of the difference, but far from all of it, is due to the higher average age of the upwardly mobile.

Another marked difference appears in comparing the three groups shown in the table who had been upwardly mobile during their careers.

Among these upwardly mobile workers, 39 per cent of the educated white-collar workers, 29 per cent of the uneducated white-collar workers, and only 13 per cent of the uneducated blue-collar workers had moved twice or more within the state. This means that among workers who had moved upward during their careers, migration had been most frequent among the educated white-collar workers and least frequent among the uneducated blue-collar workers--a direct relation between migration and socio-economic status. Since differences of this sort between these groups were not found in the data on number of jobs held, this may simply be another indication of the wider scale of the high-status job market; to better his position, a high-status worker moves to a different community but a low-status worker does not, unless to a Northern city.

Interstate migration. Unlike migration within the state, interstate migration patterns did not differ to any marked degree between the stable and the upwardly mobile groups of educated white-collar workers. The slight differences which were found were only what one would expect in view of the older average age of the upwardly mobile. Workers in both of these elite groups were more likely than others to have migrated across state lines, a finding which merely bears out the generalization already stated, that high occupational status was often accompanied by long-distance migration.

An apparent puzzle is presented within the low-education group. Among the uneducated, the upwardly mobile blue-collar workers had migrated across state lines more often than the stable blue-collar workers, although the latter had moved more often within North Carolina. A plausible explanation of this, though one which goes beyond our data, is the following: The uneducated but upwardly mobile blue-collar group includes workers who are ambitious and bound for the skilled labor class, whether or not they have arrived there yet. (Upwardly mobile blue-collar workers, by our definition, can be either skilled or semiskilled when interviewed.) Such workers would seem unlikely to drift repeatedly from one place to another within the state, but relatively likely to make long moves in order to better themselves. Putting this somewhat differently: Staying in one place helps a manual worker to move upward, as has been suggested earlier; but long-distance moves at the early stages of the career may also be advantageous, if opportunities for advancement are scarce in the community where the worker begins his career. These are hypotheses which might be worth pursuing, but our data cannot do more than suggest them as possibilities.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

1. Intergenerational mobility in these North Carolina communities seems to follow the same basic patterns as have been found in studies of other American communities and in studies covering the entire United States. The intergenerational mobility patterns we found in Raleigh and the Burlington-Graham area coincide rather closely, for example, with the patterns reported by the National Opinion Research Center for the United States as a whole and by Rogoff for the Indianapolis area.[35] There was

---

[35] Kahl, *The American Class Structure*, *op. cit.*, summarizing data from National Opinion Research Center, *op. cit.*; Rogoff, *op. cit.*

the usual tendency toward inheritance of general occupational level, with high-status fathers tending to have high-status sons and low-status fathers tending to have low-status sons. At the same time, as in the findings of other recent studies, there was a substantial amount of upward intergenerational mobility and a lesser amount of downward intergenerational mobility. In no present Census occupational group did more than a third of the workers have fathers in the same category. The general upward tendency can be ascribed to basic changes which have taken place in the occupational structure, in North Carolina as elsewhere in the Western world. One of the effects of industrial modernization is to eliminate low-ranking occupations and to create more high-ranking occupations which require skill and education. For this reason, sons tend to have occupations at higher levels of skill and education than their fathers'.[36]

The main differences between our findings on intergenerational mobility and the findings of other studies reflect the delayed industrialization of North Carolina and the arbitrary exclusion of Negroes from our study sample. Because of the lag in industrialization in North Carolina as compared with other regions of the United States, fewer of the workers we studied than of those in previous studies had fathers in professional occupations; this difference reflects the relatively small proportion of professional workers in North Carolina's labor force until recently. Because we excluded Negroes from our sample of workers, it included relatively few unskilled workers, and relatively few workers whose fathers were unskilled.

---

[36] Davidson and Anderson in their San Jose study published in 1937, op. cit., commented on the role of changes in the occupational structure in inducing intergenerational mobility, and all general treatments of the subject since then have emphasized this.

2. Our findings on career mobility--movement into higher or lower occupational levels during the work career--differ from earlier findings as summarized by Rogoff. She reports that previous studies generally find no more than 50 per cent of the labor force moving out of the Census level of the first full-time job. We found that more than four-fifths of the workers currently in the Census categories of "managers, proprietors, and officials" and "skilled workers and foremen" had begun at the lower levels and worked their way up. Workers currently in other Census occupational categories had followed the pattern described by Rogoff, with about half or more in each category still in the levels where they began; but even in these groups, some workers would doubtless move into other occupations, mainly higher-ranking ones, later in their careers.

Thus it appears that Piedmont North Carolina workers may be experiencing more upward career mobility than the workers described in previous studies conducted elsewhere. The probable reason for this is that more upward mobility is experienced in an industrializing community whose occupational structure is expanding, such as the communities of Piedmont North Carolina, than is generally experienced in areas which have older and more stabilized industrial patterns.[37] If North Carolina has had high rates of upward career mobility because it has been catching up with the industrialization of the North and Midwest, one would expect a slowing down of its rates of upward career mobility in the near future, unless the region can continue to attract new types of industry faster than the nation as a whole has been developing new industry in recent decades.

---

[37] The logic of this assertion is a matter of simple arithmetic. Lipset and Zetterberg in Lipset and Bendix, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27, have a

It is puzzling that the rates of intergenerational mobility we found were typical of the nation although the career mobility rates we found were high. We cannot solve this puzzle with our data.

3. Lipset and Bendix present data from their Oakland, California labor mobility study and from a 1952 University of Michigan Survey Research Center study of a national sample, to indicate that the larger the community a worker grows up in, the more successful he is likely to be in urban labor market competition.[38] Our findings lend some support to this hypothesis. Workers currently holding jobs at the upper end of the scale, such as professionals and managers, and workers with high educational attainment (the same group, for the most part) were far more likely than others to have spent their formative years in cities of more than 50,000 population. Workers reared on farms were somewhat concentrated in the low-education and low-status groups, though many of the farm-reared had risen to the upper rungs of the occupational ladder. Workers reared in

---

concise discussion of this fact and its relation to equality of opportunity, and cite research to indicate that upward mobility has increased in countries undergoing rapid industrialization and decreased in times of depression.

[38] Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., pp. 204-226.

towns of less than 50,000 population, which would include Burlington and Graham, were intermediate in education and current occupational status between the metropolitanites and the farm-reared.

While our findings in general are consistent with the Lipset and Bendix hypothesis, they show some interesting variations on the main theme in the case of the farm-reared. So far as the likelihood of holding high current occupational status was concerned, the farm-reared were at a disadvantage compared with the town-reared only if they lacked high school diplomas. Among high school graduates, the farm-reared were about as likely as the town-reared (but not the metropolis-reared) to hold white-collar jobs when interviewed. In contrast to this last finding, workers from farms were more likely than workers from either towns or metropolitan areas to have begun their careers in low-ranking jobs--and this was true of both graduates and non-graduates of high schools. Thus with high school education, a farm-reared worker was as likely as a town-reared worker to hold a high-ranking job when interviewed, even thoug he was less likely to have begun his career in a high-ranking job. From this it seems evident that the farm-reared high school graduates were more likely than the town-reared to have moved up in status during their work careers.

4. Many people, educators in particular, have complained about the high percentage of graduates of Southern colleges and universities who take jobs outside the states where they obtained their college education. In this connection it is interesting to consider our finding that high percentages of workers in the high-status occupations in two

North Carolina communities had moved into the state from outside. This finding suggests that the movement is in both directions: states like North Carolina lose many of their college graduates to other states, but other states also lose college graduates to North Carolina. What this means is that the labor market for professional and managerial jobs is not confined to localities; the college graduate can choose among many jobs, inside and outside the state where his college is located. Presumably a state which has many openings in high-status jobs will enjoy a net gain in college graduates, with more moving into the state than away from it. Our data do not show where North Carolina would rate in this respect, but they do suggest that the picture in such a state is less bleak than it is sometimes painted, even if North Carolina along with other Southern states suffers a net loss of college graduates.[39]

5. Lipset and Bendix speak of the "cumulation of advantages or disadvantages."[40] The youth whose father holds a low-status job in a small town or a farming community is likely to receive little education and to take the first job he hears about when he enters the highly restricted local labor force. The youth in a metropolitan community, whose father holds a high-status job, is apt to receive a college education

---

[39] C. Horace Hamilton, "Educational Selectivity of Net Migration from the South," Social Forces, 38: 1 (October 1959), pp. 33-42, shows that net migration of white adults from the South in the 1940-1950 decade was heavily selective of the poorly educated and only moderately selective of the highly educated, leaving a bulge in the group with 5 to 12 years' education remaining in the South. Among Negroes, net migration from the South during this decade was selective of the well educated population only.

[40] Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

and to have access to good advice when choosing his first job; in a metropolis and with a college degree, his labor market perspective is much broader and allows him more choice.[41] Thus the several advantages or disadvantages are cumulative, say Lipset and Bendix. Rural origin, low parental status, and lack of education together put a worker at a greater dissadvantage than any of them separately would, and conversely, metropolitan origin, high parental status, and high educational attainment together put a worker in a more advantageous position than he would have from any of these by itself.

Our data tend to confirm the idea that advantages and disadvantages are cumulative. The educational attainment of a worker has by far the most effect on his occupational prospects of any background characteristic; if a worker is highly educated, he will probably achieve high status, no matter what his family or community antecedents may have been. Nevertheless, his family and community antecedents are somewhat predictive of his occupational prospects whether he is highly educated or not.

6. Perhaps the most notable characteristic of our findings is their similarity to other findings in studies done elsewhere. Despite our having found somewhat higher rates of career mobility than other studies have generally found--and these rates will probably slow down as

---

[41] Reynolds and Shister have shown that even in a fairly large city, manual workers suffer from an irrational and limited view of the job opportunities available to them. Lloyd G. Reynolds and Joseph Shister, "The Worker's View of Job Opportunity," Advanced Management, 13: 4 (December 1948), pp. 170-177.

North Carolina achieves industrial parity with the rest of the nation--it seems that Southern Piedmont communities are not very different from communities in other parts of the United States, or indeed, from communities in foreign countries, in their patterns of occupational mobility. When we think of the millions of words that have been written about the unique characteristics of the South--its history, its culture, its social system--this similarity may seem surprising. Yet the likeness could have been predicted. The South is no longer a predominantly agricultural region; its economy and occupational structure increasingly resemble those of the rest of the United States. This is perhaps truer of the Carolina Piedmont than of many other sections of the South. The Piedmont was the scene of the first burst of industrialization in the South, in textiles, and it has continued to be the leading major subregion of the South in industrial development.[42]

Thus in 1959 the Piedmont resembled other areas of the Western world in placing a declining reliance on agriculture, a heavy reliance on manufacturing, and a growing reliance on distribution and the provision of services.[43] With this process comes a tremendous expansion in the variety of occupations which workers can enter. Intergenerational mobility becomes a regular feature of life in industrialized areas, and the mobility is more often upward than downward, since the educational and skill requirements of the newer occupations tend to be higher than those of the older occupations. Career mobility is also a regular feature of life in industrialized nations, but as Rogoff has shown, the route to the higher-status jobs is often intergenerational rather than career mobility, since these jobs require higher education; a worker either enters the upper part of the occupational hierarchy early in life, on the basis of education, or he may never enter it at all.

---

[42] For data bearing on this statement, see Harriet L. Herring, Southern Industry and Regional Development, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940.

[43] These three types of economic activities correspond roughly to Colin Clark's primary, secondary, and tertiary spheres of economic activity. The shift from primary to secondary, then to tertiary activities is documented in Clark's The Conditions of Economic Progress, 3rd ed., London: MacMillan, 1957.

One implication of the similarity of our findings to other findings is that the life-chances of a worker who starts from a given place in the social structure are about the same in North Carolina as in other parts of the United States. From this it would seem to follow that the findings to be presented in Chapters 3 and 4, on the correlates of mobility and occupational aspirations among North Carolina workers and high school students, may be roughly generalizable to other regions.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL ORIGINS, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, VALUES, AND WORK CAREERS

One can sum up much recent research on the factors which affect occupational careers and mobility patterns by saying that it has documented three major generalizations. First, the tendency for men to inherit the occupational status levels of their fathers is not due entirely to limitations imposed on upward mobility by external barriers; not only the objective life-chances of the poor, but also their aspiration levels are usually low.[1] Second, the values of individuals are systematically related to their aspiration levels and to the kinds of occupations they choose.[2] Third, people are influenced by other people when they decide what kinds of occupations to enter and how high in the occupational world to aspire.[3]

---

[1] On this, see R. A. Mulligan, "Socio-Economic Background and College Enrollment," *American Sociological Review*, 16 (1951), pp. 188-196; Ely Chinoy, "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers," *American Journal of Sociology*, 57 (March 1952), pp. 453-459; Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," *American Sociological Review*, 18 (June 1953), pp. 233-242; Genevieve Knupfer, "Portrait of the Underdog," pp. 255-263, and Herbert H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes," pp. 426-442, in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, ed., *Class, Status, and Power*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1953; Robert H. Guest, "Work Careers and Aspirations of Automobile Workers," *American Sociological Review*, 19 (April 1954), pp. 155-163; LaMar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Ambition," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (December 1956), pp. 703-709; Archie O. Haller and William H. Sewell, "Farm Residence and Levels of Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (January 1957), pp. 407-411; William H. Sewell, Archie O. Haller, and Murray A. Straus, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (February 1957), pp. 67-73; Jackson Toby, "Orientation to Education as a Factor in School Maladjustment of Lower-Class Children," *Social Forces*, 35 (March 1957), pp. 259-266; Dorothy L. Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," *American Sociological Review*, 24 (April 1959), pp. 189-202; J. Kenneth Morland, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Mill and Town Children in a Southern Community," *Social Forces*, 39 (December 1960), pp. 169-175.

Most of the studies on occupational aspirations and choices have delt with the hopes and expectations of students rather than with the actual careers of workers,[4] and most of them have treated either values or interpersonal influences alone as the independent variable which explains career plans. The interaction of class origins, values, personal influences, and occupational aspirations and accomplishments has yet to be studied in systematic detail.[5]

---

[2] For studies relevant to the relationship of values to aspiration levels or occupational choice, see Louis Schneider and Sverre Lysgaard, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern," American Sociological Review, 18 (April 1953), pp. 142-149; Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21 (April 1956), pp. 203-211; Morris Rosenberg, with the assistance of Edward A. Suchmanand Rose K. Goldsen, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957; Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Value Orientations in Educational and Occupational Choices," Rural Sociology, 24 (September 1959), pp. 246-256; and Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Values and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (December 1960), pp. 126-135.

[3] Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (Summer 1953), pp. 186-203; Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24 (December 1953), pp. 836-845; David J. Bordua, "Educational Aspirations and Parental Stress on College," Social Forces, 38 (March 1960), pp. 262-269.

[4] The studies cited above by Chinoy, Reissman, Knupfer, Hyman, Guest, and Meier and Bell have used adults as subjects, but of these, only the Chinoy, Guest, and Reissman studies have treated specifically occupational aspirations.

[5] An attempt to work both values and personal influence into a common frame of reference, though in a preliminary way, is found in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (December 1960), pp. 116-125.

This chapter will attempt some steps toward understanding the joint effects of class origin, values, and personal influence on the actual careers of adult workers. Occupational status and career patterns will be treated as dependent variables, and an attempt made to explain them, in so far as possible, on the basis of several independent variables: workers' family backgrounds, the values they cite as reasons for their occupational choices and subsequent job changes, and the main person who advised and influenced them in their occupational decisions.[6] The data will be from the interviews with 380 workers in Raleigh and Burlington-Graham.

---

[6] The project proposal for this research used the term "reference group orientations" and listed several hypotheses involving reference group orientations as examples of the kinds of things that would be studied. In this report we use instead the term "personal influence." This refers to one of the kinds of reference group effects discussed in the project proposal, "influence group orientations." Attempts to obtain valid measures of "identification reference group orientations" were unsuccessful, and "approval group orientations" turned out to be essentially indistinguishable from influence group orientations in the pilot research, not yet completed when the project proposal was written, which is discussed in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," *op. cit.* It seems likely on the basis of hindsight that identification group orientation and influence group orientation may perhaps be conceptually and operationally distinguishable, though they overlap considerably, but that approval group orientation is not distinguishable from the other two types of orientation. For discussions of the concept of reference group and types of reference group orientations, see Robert K. Merton and Alice S. Rossi, "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," in Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 2nd ed., Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957; Tamotsu Shibutani, "Reference Groups as Perspectives," *American Journal of Sociology*, 60 (May 1955), pp. 562-569; Harold H. Kelley, "Two Functions of Reference Groups," in Guy E. Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley, ed., *Readings in Social Psychology*, New York: Henry Holt, 1952, pp. 410-414; Muzafer Sherif, "The Concept of Reference Group in Human Relations," in Muzafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson, ed., *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, New York: Harper, 1953, pp. 203-231; Ralph H. Turner, "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," *American Journal of Sociology*, 61 (January 1956), pp. 316-328. The concept of reference group was originally developed by Herbert Hyman, *The Psychology of Status*, Archives of Psychology, No. 269 (June 1942).

FACTORS RELATED TO FIRST JOB

It has long been known, and was shown for our sample in the previous chapter (Table 16), that the occupational status of workers' fathers is highly predictive of the status level of the workers' own first jobs. Table 23 repeats this finding and shows, for workers whose first jobs were in Hollingshead IOS levels 1 and 2 (A), 3 and 4 (B), 5 (C), and 6 and 7 (D), the distributions of responses to three questions concerning the influences and values that helped to determine their choice of first jobs.

The question on number of advisers was, "Before you took your first regular full-time job, what people gave you advice or information about your future work career?" Possible responses were mother, father, wife, other relatives, teachers or professors, clergymen, someone in the occupation or at the work place, foreman or other work superior, other men (not relatives), other women (not relatives). Interviewers were instructed to check any advisers in this list who were mentioned spontaneously or only after prompting. Both the spontaneously mentioned advisers and those named only after prompting are included as advisers in tabulations reported in this chapter.[7]

The question on main adviser, which followed the question on number of advisers, was "What three people had the strongest influence on your

---

[7] All of the personal influence questions used in this study were adapted from questions used in Howard S. Gall, "The Functions of Multi-Group Sanctions in the Academic Decisions of Adolescents," unpublished M. A. thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1955.

TABLE 23. Father's IOS, Number of Advisers, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value, by IOS of First Job

Characteristic	Status of First Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a. Father's IOS								
High (A or B)	(48)	88.9	(64)	59.8	(7)	35.0	(49)	27.5
Low (C or D)	(6)	11.1	(43)	40.2	(13)	65.0	(129)	72.5
Total	(54)	100.0	(107)	100.0	(20)	100.0	(178)	100.0
b. Number of Advisers								
4 or more	(19)	33.9	(32)	28.3	(4)	20.0	(28)	14.9
1-3	(33)	58.9	(62)	54.9	(13)	65.0	(109)	58.0
None	(4)	7.1	(19)	16.8	(3)	15.0	(51)	27.1
Total	(56)	99.9	(113)	100.0	(20)	100.0	(188)	100.0
c. Main Adviser								
Non-family	(26)	46.4	(33)	29.2	(3)	15.0	(24)	12.8
Family	(25)	44.6	(50)	44.2	(13)	65.0	(96)	51.1
None	(5)	8.9	(30)	26.5	(4)	20.0	(68)	36.2
Total	(56)	99.9	(113)	99.9	(20)	100.0	(188)	100.1
d. Occupational Value								
Nature of work	(37)	66.1	(28)	24.8	(8)	40.0	(48)	25.5
Career	(6)	10.7	(21)	18.6	(2)	10.0	(7)	3.7
Other extrinsic	(13)	23.2	(64)	56.6	(10)	50.0	(133)	70.7
Total	(56)	100.0	(113)	100.0	(20)	100.0	(188)	99.9

plans for a work career before you actually started working on your first regular full-time job? Who had the most influence? The second most?" Tabulations reported in this chapter refer to the adviser ranked first in influence on career plans before taking the first job.

The question on *occupational value* was, "Why did you go into this kind of work instead of some other kind of work?" This question or one worded slightly differently was asked with respect to every job the respondent had ever held, but the tabulations in this section of this chapter refer only to the first job. Interviewers were instructed not to prompt, but to code responses on the spot and check one of 11 categories for the first reason mentioned.[8] The 11 kinds of reasons were subsequently combined into three types of occupational values: (1) *career* (high income; prestige; advancement), (2) *other extrinsic* values (negative extrinsic, such as only job available, not qualified for anything else, etc.; secure income; freedom from supervision; work group, people in that occupation are pleasant, etc.; other positive extrinsic, such as hours, near home, physical working conditions, etc.); and *nature of work* (enjoy the work, self-expression, creativity, etc.; traditional family occupation; serve humanity, contribute to society, etc.).[9]

---

[8] The rationale and justification for coding only the item mentioned first in response to open-ended questions of this type are given in Hans Zeisel, *Say It with Figures*, 4th ed., New York: Harper, 1957, pp. 79-81.

[9] The list of 11 occupational values was adapted from the list of values used in occupational studies at Cornell University conducted by Goldsen, Suchman, Rosenberg, and others; for example, see Rosenberg, *Occupations and Values*, *op. cit.*, p. 142. Our typology derived by combining the longer list into three general types is different from the typology developed by Rosenberg. The main difference between our longer

Number of advisers. Part b of Table 23 shows how many people had given occupational advice before the first job to men whose first jobs were in the four IOS levels. The higher the status of the first job, the greater the number of advisers was likely to have been. Of the men whose first jobs were in IOS level A, 34 per cent had received advice from four or more people and only 7 per cent had received no advice from anyone. In contrast, of the men whose first jobs were in level D, only 15 per cent had been advised by four or more people and fully 27 per cent had not been advised by anyone. Men with first jobs in levels B and C were intermediate in number of advisers, and the relationship between number of advisers and level of first job was consistent with only one minor reversal of the relationship—17 per cent of the men with level-B first jobs and only 15 per cent with level-C first jobs had received no advice at all, but the latter percentage represents only three men.

Main adviser. Part c of Table 23 shows that the higher the status of the first job the more likely the worker was to name someone outside his family as the principal adviser, and the less likely he was to be unable to name any one principal adviser. Forty-six per cent of the men with level-A first jobs but only 13 per cent of the men with level-D first jobs named people outside their families as the most influential

---

list and the Cornell list is our inclusion of the negative extrinsic and positive extrinsic categories. The Cornell list was developed for use with college students, virtually all of whom were aiming for white-collar work, and among these kinds of people work is more likely to be chosen because of positive attraction and less likely to be drifted into for extraneous reasons or little reason at all than among manual workers.

advisers, and men who began their careers at levels B and C were again intermediate. The most frequently named main advisers outside the family were prospective supervisors and men already employed in the occupation or at the place of work.

Occupational value. Part d of Table 23 shows the kinds of occupational values which men who started at the four IOS levels cited as reasons for having chosen their first jobs. Striking differences appear in the percentages who cited the nature of work as the main value: 67, 25, 40, and 25 per cent among men whose first jobs were in levels A, B, C, and D, respectively. Thus within both the white-collar and blue-collar classes considered separately, men starting at the higher levels were more likely to name the nature of work as the main occupational value; but in this respect the skilled workers resembled the upper white-collar workers more than either the lower white-collar or lower blue-collar workers did.

"Career" values were the least often cited occupational values at all four first-job levels. They were most likely to be cited by men starting at level B and least likely to be cited by men starting at level D. Considering only the workers who did not name nature of work as the main value, the percentage who named career rather than "other extrinsic" values rose directly with the status level of the first job. If we regard career and nature of work as values which indicate a fairly definite positive attraction to the first job, and other extrinsic values as a residual category indicating lack of positive attraction to work other than the need to find some job and make a living, then the percentage of men who were positively attracted to their first jobs was highest in the top status level and lowest in the bottom status level, but slightly higher in the skilled blue-collar than in the lower white-collar group.

From the findings just presented it seems clear that father's status, number of advisers, main adviser, and occupational values were all related to the occupational level at which men entered the labor force. The discussion below and Tables 24 through 29 are all addressed to the question, did these variables affect the level of first job independently of each other, or were they so highly correlated with each other that one of them alone can explain the level of first job as well as all of them together can? In this discussion we try to show that father's status explains more variance in the level of first job than the influence and value variables do, but that these also had some effect independently of father's status.

Advisers, values, and father's status. Table 24 shows the numbers of advisers, main advisers, and occupational values which entered into the first-job decisions of workers whose fathers were in IOS levels A, B, C, and D. There was very little relationship between father's status and number of advisers (Part *a*), although the sons of level-D fathers were slightly more likely than the rest to have received no advice at all and the sons of both groups of blue-collar fathers (C and D) were slightly less likely than the sons of white collar fathers to have been advised by four or more fathers. The higher the father's status, the more likely he was to be unable to name any one main adviser; but this relationship was less strong than the relationship between level of first job and main adviser (compare Part *b* of Table 24 with Part *c* of Table 23). Occupational values (Part *c*) were also related to father's status, but the relationship was not direct or consistent, though there was some

TABLE 24. Father's IOS, Number of Advisers, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value with Respect to First Job

Characteristic	Father's IOS A (Highest) N	 %	 B N	 %	 C N	 %	 D (Lowest) N	 %
a. Number of Advisers								
4 or more	(14)	29.2	(31)	25.0	(17)	19.1	(21)	19.4
1 - 3	(25)	52.1	(69)	55.6	(56)	62.9	(61)	56.5
None	(9)	18.8	(24)	19.4	(16)	18.0	(26)	24.1
Total	(48)	100.1	(124)	100.0	(89)	100.0	(108)	100.0
b. Main Adviser								
Non-family	(19)	39.6	(31)	25.0	(17)	19.1	(16)	14.8
Family	(20)	41.7	(62)	50.0	(48)	53.9	(52)	48.1
None	(9)	18.8	(31)	25.0	(24)	27.0	(40)	37.0
Total	(48)	100.1	(124)	100.0	(89)	100.0	(108)	99.9
c. Occupational Value								
Nature of work	(23)	47.9	(48)	39.3	(20)	22.7	(29)	27.1
Career	(9)	18.8	(8)	6.6	(12)	13.6	(3)	2.8
Other extrinsic	(16)	33.3	(66)	54.1	(56)	63.6	(75)	70.1
Total	(48)	100.0	(122)	100.0	(88)	99.9	(107)	100.0

tendency for sons of high-status fathers to name nature of work as an occupational value. This relationship was also less marked than the relationship (Part d of the previous table) between occupational values and levels of first jobs.

These findings point to the conclusion that advice and values with respect to the first job were less strongly related to father's status than they were to the level of first job. From this we infer that advisers and values may have had some affect on the level of first job, independently of the status levels of workers' fathers. On the other hand, the fact that there was some relationship between fathers' status levels and the sources of career advice their sons received supports a hypothesis advanced by Lipset and Bendix. They say that one reason why occupational levels tend to be inherited is that youths of high-status family background have access to more and better advice than the sons of manual workers.[10]

Number of advisers, main adviser, and occupational values. Tables 25 and 26 show the relation of main adviser to number of advisers (Table 25) and occupational value (Table 26) with respect to first job. Number

---

[10] Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959, pp. 194-196. It should be noted that our interpretation assumes that advice and values actually influenced the choice of first jobs. The data could also be interpreted to mean that youths who had the intention and ability to enter the higher-ranking jobs tended to seek more advice and develop distinctive values after deciding on their career plans—i.e., that the level of first job affected advice and values more than vice versa. Our data do not enable us to say which of these interpretations is more accurate, and there is probably some truth to both.

TABLE 25. Main Adviser by Father's IOS and Number of Advisers (First Job)

Father's IOS and Number of Advisers	Main Adviser: Non-family N	Non-family %	Family N	Family %	None N	None %	Total N	Total %
Father High (A or B)								
4 or more advisers	(19)	42.2	(24)	53.3	(2)	4.4	(45)	100.0
0 - 3 advisers	(31)	24.4	(58)	45.7	(38)	29.9	(127)	99.9
Father Low (C or D)								
4 or more advisers	(7)	18.4	(24)	63.2	(7)	18.4	(38)	100.0
0 - 3 advisers	(26)	16.4	(76)	47.8	(57)	35.8	(159)	100.0

TABLE 26. Occupational Value by Father's IOS and Main Adviser (First Job)

Father's IOS and Main Adviser	Occupational Value: Nature of Work N	Nature of Work %	Career N	Career %	Other Extrinsic N	Other Extrinsic %	Total N	Total %
Father High (A or B)								
Non-family main adv.	(27)	54.0	(18)	36.0	(5)	10.0	(50)	100.0
Family main adviser	(37)	45.1	(37)	45.1	(8)	9.8	(82)	100.0
No main adviser	(7)	17.5	(27)	67.5	(6)	15.0	(40)	100.0
Father Low (C or D)								
Non-family main adv.	(11)	34.4	(18)	54.5	(4)	12.1	(33)	100.0
Family main adviser	(30)	30.3	(63)	63.6	(6)	6.1	(99)	100.0
No main adviser	(8)	12.7	(50)	79.4	(5)	7.9	(63)	100.0

of advisers and main adviser are obviously somewhat related by definition, since a man who had received no advice could not have a main adviser. It was possible, however, to have received advice but to be unable to name any one person as the main adviser, so the two questions, while related, are not identical. Whether a man's father held a white-collar or a blue-collar job, the man was relatively likely to have no main adviser if he had been given advice by only a few people. Those who did name someone as main adviser were more likely to name someone outside the family if they had been advised by four or more people; this relationship was fairly strong among sons of blue-collar workers. Part of the reason for many advisers to be associated with non-family main advisers is that most workers claimed to have received some advice from family members, but only those who named relatively many advisers were likely to claim advice from people outside their families; thus for workers who cited fewer than four advisers, non-family members were often excluded from the field of eligibles for main adviser.

Table 26 indicates that occupational value was related to main adviser, and that the relationship was of a similar kind whether the worker's father was of high or low status. Within each parental status class, workers whose main advisers were family members did not differ markedly in values from those who main advisers were outside their families, though the latter were slightly more likely to name nature of work as the principal value. Workers who did not name any main adviser, however, were far less likely than the rest to name nature of work as a value.

On the basis of these findings we conclude that number of advisers and main adviser are so strongly related to each other that in the analysis below which seeks to ascertain whether father's status, occupational advice, and values have independent and cumulative effects on the level of first job, we may safely use only one advice variable and eliminate the other. Values seem only slightly related to sources of advice, especially if we consider only those workers who named someone as main adviser--among these, values were hardly related at all to main adviser. Values and advice appear sufficiently unrelated to father's IOS to be regarded as having effects on the level of first job which cannot be explained on the basis of father's status. The discussion below and Tables 27 through 29 will explore the cumulative effects on first job of father's status, main adviser, and occupational value.[11]

Cumulative effects on level of first job. Table 27 is a matrix of IOS levels of first jobs by patterns of father's status, main adviser, and occupational value. We present it in raw form so that the reader can see the data from which we worked to obtain Tables 28 and 29, which test the hypothesis of cumulative effects. Each combination of father's

---

[11] Main adviser rather than number of advisers was retained for the analysis of cumulative effects on grounds of expediency: from the marginals it appeared likely that cross-tabulations involving main adviser would have fewer cells with too few cases to be analyzed meaningfully. As this is written, it appears that number of advisers would have been the better variable to retain, since it was more independent of father's status than main adviser was. (Table 24.) We did not substitute number of advisers for main adviser in the analysis would have delayed completion of the report beyond the deadline.

TABLE 27. Matrix of First-Job IOS Levels by Father's IOS, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value Types

	First-Job IOS Level							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Type	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
+++	4	2	1	14	0	1	1	23
++-	6	8	2	12	1	7	1	37
+-+	6	2	5	11	4	11	7	46
+--	10	7	5	1	1	3	0	27
+0+	1	1	3	12	2	8	6	33
+0-	2	0	0	1	0	3	1	7
-++	1	1	2	8	0	8	3	23
-+-	0	3	1	3	4	12	7	30
--+	1	0	4	12	4	38	9	68
---	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	11
-0+	0	0	1	12	2	29	10	54
-0-	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	9
Total	33	24	25	87	20	128	51	368

status, main adviser, and value is represented by three symbols. The first stands for father's status. A worker was shown earlier to be more apt to begin his career in a high-ranking job if his father was a white-collar worker; therefore a plus mark (+) designates sons of white-collar fathers, and a minus (-) designates sons of blue-collar fathers. It was also shown that the workers beginning at the upper status levels tended to name people outside their families as main advisers, were unlikely to name no one at all as main advisers, and were also somewhat unlikely to name members of their families as main advisers; therefore the second symbol designates non-family main advisers as plus (+), family main advisers as minus (-), and no main adviser at all as zero (0). Workers starting in high-ranking jobs were relatively likely to cite nature of work as an occupational value; therefore the third symbol tells whether nature of work was (+) or was not (-) cited as the chief occupational value which influenced the choice of the first job.

Thus the combination (+++) designates workers whose fathers were in the white-collar class, whose main advisers were people outside their families, and whose main occupational value was nature of work; if the hypothesis of cumulative effects is correct, these should turn out to have had high-ranking first jobs. Similarly the combinations (-0-) and (---) refer to men whose fathers were manual workers, who had no main advisers or else main advisers within their families and whose occupational values were of the career or other extrinsic type; by the hypothesis these should have begun their careers at low levels. Other types of workers should be intermediate in status of first job. To eliminate cells with two few cases to be meaningfully interpreted, the no-adviser and family-advisertypes are combined in Tables 28 and 29, but we have kept them separate in Table 27 in case the reader wishes to examine the data in more detail than is given in our discussion below.

Table 28 tests the hypothesis that occupational value is related to level of first job independently of father's status and main adviser. Table 29 tests the hypothesis that main adviser is related to level of first job independently of father's status and occupational value. These two tables present identical information, arranged differently, derived from Table 27. Together they test the hypothesis that father's status, occupational value, and main adviser have cumulative effects so that the more plusses a worker gets, the higher the level of his first job is apt to be.

The hypothesis concerning occupational value (Table 28) does not receive consistent support; it is supported among workers whose fathers were of low status but not among workers whose fathers were of high status. Among the workers of low parental status background, the mean and median IOS of first job was higher (a smaller number) when nature of work was named as the value, in both comparisons; i.e., the -++ group had higher first jobs than the -+- group, and the --+ group had higher first jobs than the --- group, as predicted by the hypothesis. In the two comparisons within the high parental background category, however, both of these relationships are reversed when the median is used to measure first job levels, and one of them is reversed when the mean is used as the indicator of first job levels. In fact, the +-- workers had

TABLE 28. Mean and Median IOS Level of First Job by Occupational Value, Controlling Father's IOS and Main Adviser

Father's IOS, Main Adviser, and Occupational Value	IOS of First Job Mean	Median	N
Father High (A or B)			
Non-family main adviser			
Nature of work (+++)	3.5	3.8	23
Career or other extrinsic (++-)	3.5	3.5	37
Family or no main adviser			
Nature of work (+-+)	4.6	4.4	79
Career or other extrinsic (+--)	2.9	2.2	34
Father Low (C or D)			
Non-family main adviser			
Nature of work (-++)	4.8	4.4	22
Career or other extrinsic (-+-)	5.4	5.8	30
Family or no main adviser			
Nature of work (--+)	5.5	5.9	122
Career or other extrinsic (---)	5.7	6.1	19

TABLE 29. Mean and Median IOS Level of First Job by Main Adviser, Controlling Father's IOS and Occupational Value

Father's IOS, Occupational Value, and Main Adviser	IOS of First Job		
	Mean	Median	N
Father High (A or B)			
Nature of work			
Non-family (+++)	3.5	3.8	23
Family or none (++-)	4.6	4.4	79
Career or other extrinsic			
Non-family (+-+)	3.5	3.5	37
Family or none (+--)	2.9	2.2	34
Father Low (C or D)			
Nature of work			
Non-family (-++)	4.8	4.4	22
Family or none (-+-)	5.5	5.9	122
Career or other extrinsic			
Non-family (--+)	5.4	5.8	30
Family or none (---)	5.7	6.1	19

the highest-ranking first jobs of all, although according to the hypothesis they should have had the lowest-ranking jobs of any group whose fathers were white-collar workers.[12]

At least two interpretations of these mixed findings are possible. One is that the data do not mean much because the N's and differences are small and the results are different when the father's status is varied. This does not seem likely, even though one hesitates to claim too much for analysis based on N's as small as 19, 22, and 23, since rather consistent and theoretically plausible results were obtained in many other analyses of the same data, sometimes with N's as small as these. A more likely interpretation is that occupational value patterns do not have the same intrinsic meaning at different levels of the socio-economic hierarchy. Different orders of phenomena are involved when one man decides whether to pump gas or to tend a factory machine, and another man decides whether to attend law school or medical school. The applicant to the professional school is deciding which of two highly attractive occupations would be most congenial to his personality needs, while the man deciding between two manual jobs may be deciding some such question as whether low pay or unpleasant working conditions are more distasteful to him. The whole frame of reference within which a young man becomes aware of value alternatives and chooses among them is likely to depend upon the social class environment within which he grows up, and this of course is largely a function of his father's occupational status.[13]

---

[12] Strictly speaking, statistics such as the mean and median should not be used with these data since the data are only ordinal, and their use may make our findings seem more precise than they really are. Despite this it seemed advisable to use them, since without some simplifying device of this kind the findings, which are essentially rather simple, would seem exceedingly complex.

From this interpretation it seems to follow that to study most fruitfully the impact of values on occupational decisions among boys at different social class levels, one would need a more sensitive set of concepts and research operations than the ones employed in this study and others like it. In different social strata there may exist not only differing occupational values, but differing dimensions along which occupational values are arrayed.

The results concerning personal influences on first jobs (Table 29) are more encouraging. With father's status and occupational value controlled, three of the four comparisons support the hypothesis that the level of first job will tend to be higher when someone outside the family is the main adviser. That this relationship was more similar in the white-collar and blue-collar father's status categories than the value relationship was seems reasonable. It has been shown that the workers whose main advisers were people outside their families tended to be the same workers who named large numbers of people as having given some kind of advice. The great majority of men had received some advice from at least one family member; many had also been advised by outsiders, but many others had not, and these last tended to take low-ranking first jobs. The naming of outsiders as important sources of advice and the naming of large numbers of advisers both seem to represent knowledge of available job opportunities plus inclination to seek such knowledge, and these would logically put any worker in a favorable position to find a desirable first job, no matter what his social background.

---

[13] Kahl's study of working-class boys in Boston shows that in many working-class families, it never even occurs to anyone that a member of the family might rise into a high-ranking occupation. For some of Kahl's subjects, the chance to do this by attending college was objectively present but was not perceived. Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," op. cit.

Together, these findings on values and advice as related to first jobs suggest an implication for vocational counseling. It may not be possible to alter a student's basic values, but it also may not be necessary, at least if his class background is high. On the other hand, the finding on sources of advice suggests that sheer knowledge of the labor market may materially improve his chances to secure a desirable job; and counselors are in a good position to supply knowledge even if they cannot change values, if the students are willing to listen to them.

The hypothesis of cumulative effects is supported for workers whose fathers were in manual occupations. For those whose fathers were of high status, the results concerning values were the opposite of those predicted, and the results concerning main advisers were inconsistent. Before we leave this topic, some comment seems in order regarding the one strongly deviant group of workers: the +-- group, whose fathers were of high status but who did not name somone outside the family as main adviser and whose occupational value was not the nature of work. According to the hypothesis these should have been about average in status of first job, but in fact they had by far the highest first-job status. Limitations of time have made it impossible for us to analyze other characteristics of this group which might account for their deviant pattern, but we might speculate that their fathers tended to be of very high status, not merely of white-collar status; this being the case, they would be in a good position to attend college and professional or graduate school, and they would not need to go outside their families to get sound occupational advice. This still leaves unexplained their occupational values; one would expect such a favored group to select occupations on the basis of the nature of work involved, and they had not done this.[14]

VOCATIONAL COUNSELING AND FIRST JOB

The purpose of vocational counseling is to make the individual aware of his own capabilities and interests and of how these fit the available career opportunities. Usually the counselor sees his task as helping to fit the worker to the type of work which best suits his needs and aptitudes, without any necessary reference to the level of his work in the status hierarchy. Nevertheless, counseling which makes people aware of the range of occupations potentially open to them should be expected to increase the likelihood of their finding high-status jobs, since most workers if given the choice will prefer high-ranking to low-ranking work.[15] Table 30 represents an attempt to cast some light on the relation between vocational counseling and level of first job. The attempt is not very successful because of the small number of workers who said that they had received counseling and because we have no information concerning the type or extent of counseling that was involved, but the findings may be suggestive of things worth exploring in more systematic research on the effects of counseling.

---

[14] Further analysis will be undertaken in the hope of answering the questions posed by this group and others as well. It is possible that some problems will be clarified by grouping "career" with "nature of work" in the plus group for analysis of cumulative effects. There is logic to such a grouping, since career and nature of work both seem to stand for positive attractions while "other extrinsic" values suggest that the worker has more or less blundered into some job or occupation for lack of anything better to do.

[15] Lloyd G. Reynolds and Joseph Shister, in "The Worker's View of Job Opportunity," Advanced Management, 13: 4 (December 1948), pp.170-177, show that sheer ignorance of available opportunities often accounts for the failure of workers to advance to better jobs.

Only 81 of 366 workers who answered the question said that their schools had offered any kind of formal vocational counseling. These 81 included 22, 31, and 17 per cent of the workers whose first jobs were in levels A, B, and C and D combined, respectively. (Levels C and D are combined because of the extremely small number of workers, only four, who said that their schools had counseling and who began work at level C.) One of the 81 did not answer the remaining questions about counseling. Of the 80 who did, 45 said that they themselves had received some counseling, and these included 67 per cent (8 of 12), 59 per cent, and 50 per cent of the respondents whose first jobs were in levels A, B, and C or D, respectively. Of the 45 who had received counseling, 22 said that the counseling had had some effect on their occupational choices. These 22 included somewhat more than half (12 of 20) of those who had begun their careers in Level B, and somewhat fewer than half of of those who had begun in level A or in manual work.

Thus fewer than 6 per cent of the 366 respondents to the initial counseling question and barely more than one-fourth of those whose schools offered counseling were willing to acknowledge any influence of counseling on their own careers. We did not ask any questions concerning the nature of any effects which counseling might have had, but

TABLE 30. Vocational Counseling and IOS Level of First Job

Questions about Vocational Counseling	IOS of First Job					
	A (Highest)		B		C or D (Manual)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
a. Did your school offer vocational counseling?						
Yes	(12)	21.8	(35)	31.3	(34)	17.1
No	(43)	78.2	(77)	68.7	(165)	82.9
Total	(55)	100.0	(112)	100.0	(199)	100.0
b. (If yes) Did you receive counseling?						
Yes	(8)	66.7	(20)	58.8	(17)	50.0
No	(4)	33.3	(14)	41.2	(17)	50.0
Total	(12)	100.0	(34)	100.0	(34)	100.0
c. (If yes to "b") Did counseling influence your occupational plans?						
Yes	(3)	37.5	(12)	60.0	(7)	41.2
No	(5)	62.5	(8)	40.0	(10)	58.8
Total	(8)	100.0	(20)	100.0	(17)	100.0

unpublished results of a study conducted among college students by Richard L. Simpson indicate that more than half the students who attributed influence to vocational counseling, when asked to describe the influence, said that counseling merely strengthened the plans they had already made. Almost none in this college study said that counseling had changed their career plans, though a sizable minority said that it had made them more aware of the features of certain occupations and may thereby have speeded up their career choices. From the Burlington-Graham and Raleigh data and from this college study it seems a safe conclusion that vocational counseling does not often have a significant effect on career plans, or that if it does, the effects are seldom perceived by the persons involved. Findings reported in the previous section of this chapter nevertheless suggest that counseling, if effectively presented, might improve workers' career chances by broadening their knowledge of the labor market.

It would be unwise to generalize from the findings on the relationship of counseling to the level of first job. Very few cases are involved, and we do not know anything about the exact nature of the counseling to which the workers were referring. Despite these serious limitations of the data, it may be in order to comment briefly on the findings.

The higher the level of the first job, the higher was the percentage of workers who had received counseling, among those whose schools offered counseling. This might mean a number of things. It might mean that counselors do not make enough effort to reach the students from lower-class backgrounds, who are the ones most in need of help, or that the students most likely to seek counseling are the ones who least need it. Alternatively, it could mean that counseling does have a favorable effect on a worker's occupational chances.

The workers most likely to say that their schools had offered counseling were those whose first jobs were in level B, the lower white-collar group. This finding is based on a total N of 366 and is probably rather trustworthy. It is possible that these workers actually did come from schools which were more apt to give counseling, but this does not seem likely, since the level-A workers included a higher percentage who had originated in metropolitan areas, and a metropolitan area is more likely than a small town or farm community to offer counseling in its schools. What the findings may mean is that workers who began at level A, since they tended to come from high-status families, had access to all the occupational information they needed without recourse to school counseling, and simply forgot that such counseling had been available to them. Workers who began at level B, on the other hand, were often from manual workers' families; it seems likely that a manual worker's son who is ambitious will take advantage of whatever counseling his school may offer him, and be more apt to remember it in later years. This interpretation is consistent with the finding that among the workers who said that they had received counseling, those who began their careers in level B were somewhat more likely than the rest to say that the counseling had influenced their occupational choices.

This last finding is based on too small an N to be very trustworthy, but together the findings suggest the hypothesis, which might be worth exploring in future research, that vocational counseling has its greatest impact on students whose families are slightly below average in status and who themselves are upwardly mobile into the lower white-collar ranks. Logically these students would seem likely to want information about potential careers and to be unable to get it from their own families and associates.

INFLUENCE, VALUES, AND PRESENT JOB

It was shown earlier that a highly ranked first job was associated with a large number of advisers and a non-family main adviser and, within the blue-collar and white-collar first-job categories considered separately, with nature of work as an occupational value. In this section we will see whether these same relationships prevailed in connection with the levels of current jobs, i.e., whether the same patterns of influence and values were associated with present job levels as were associated with first-job levels. Tables 31 and 32 give information on this question. The questions on number of advisers, main adviser, and occupational value were similar to those described earlier except that they referred to the decision to take the present rather than the first job.

Table 31 indicates that the relationship of personal influence to level of present job was only partially the same as that between personal influence and level of first job. In both cases the main adviser was more likely to be someone outside the family if the worker's occupational status was high, though the percentage of men who did not name a main adviser was higher and not consistently related to status

TABLE 31. Main Adviser and Number of Advisers with Respect to Present Job, by IOS of Present Job

	IOS of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
Characteristic	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a. Main Adviser								
Non-family	(26)	25.7	(24)	17.0	(6)	12.0	(11)	13.3
Family	(43)	42.6	(79)	56.0	(33)	66.0	(43)	51.8
None	(32)	31.7	(38)	27.0	(11)	22.0	(29)	34.9
Total	(101)	100.0	(141)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(83)	100.0
b. No. of Advisers								
4 or more	(16)	15.8	(38)	27.0	(13)	26.0	(19)	22.9
1 - 3	(57)	56.4	(73)	51.8	(26)	52.0	(40)	48.2
None	(28)	27.7	(30)	21.3	(11)	22.0	(24)	28.9
Total	(101)	99.9	(141)	100.1	(50)	100.0	(83)	100.0

level in the case of the present job. A different relationship prevailed between number of advisers and level of present job than between number of advisers and level of first job. The number of advisers tended to rise with the status level of the first job, but with respect to present job the relationship was curvilinear. Men with present jobs at levels A and D were relatively likely to name no advisers at all or more than three, while men at present-job levels B and C were relatively likely to name from one to three advisers. One might interpret this to mean that men at the top did not need advice and men at the bottom did not know where to get it. In both of these tabulations involving advice and present jobs, the differences between groups were much smaller than in the first-job tabulations, and the differences concerning present jobs and advice may represent chance variation rather than real differences.

Table 32 reveals a marked shift from nature of work as a value influencing the choice of first jobs to career considerations as a value influencing the choice of present jobs. Part a of the table shows the occupational values which influenced the choice of present jobs by men with present jobs at levels A, D, C, and D. Part b shows what the occupational values with respect to the first job had been for these same groups of men. In both of these as in Table 23, where workers were grouped by level of first job, men in the higher occupational classes were relatively likely to cite the nature of work as their chief occupational value, except that the level-C men were more likely than the level-B men to do so.

Thus the main relationship, between nature of work as an

TABLE 32. Occupational Value for Present Job and for First Job by IOS of Present Job

Occupational Value	IOS of Present Job							
	A (Highest)		B		C		D (Lowest)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
a. Present Job								
Nature of work	(29)	28.7	(22)	15.7	(8)	16.0	(9)	10.8
Career	(47)	46.5	(53)	37.9	(21)	42.0	(33)	39.8
Other extrinsic	(25)	24.8	(65)	46.4	(21)	42.0	(41)	49.4
Total	(101)	100.0	(140)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(83)	100.0
b. First Job								
Nature of work	(50)	49.5	(36)	25.7	(16)	32.0	(19)	22.9
Career	(12)	11.9	(16)	11.4	(4)	8.0	(4)	4.8
Other extrinsic	(39)	38.6	(87)	62.1	(30)	60.0	(60)	72.3
Total	(101)	100.0	(140)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(83)	100.0

occupational value and status level of job, held for both first and present job decisions. Nevertheless, a major shift occurred between the time when workers chose their first jobs and the time when they chose their present jobs. "Other extrinsic" values were cited more often than any other as reasons for choosing the first job, with nature of work cited next most often and career values cited by only about one-tenth of all the workers. In contrast, career and other extrinsic values were cited about equally often as reasons for choosing the present job, with nature of work far behind.

A probable reason for the shift in values is that many workers give serious thought to the nature of the work they are entering when they choose their first jobs, and are only dimly aware of the possibilities of advancement within the various occupational fields they consider; but by the time they are ready to change jobs later on, they have already settled down in one general type of work and look for advancement within this field rather than for movement into radically different types of occupations. This would seem to be especially true at the upper end of the occupational hierarchy. Workers currently in the top-ranking occupations tend to have specialized skills which are not transferable to other kinds of work, and many of them have developed a sense of occupational identity which would make them reluctant to give up the kind of work they do. It was among the men currently in level A that the greatest shift from nature of work to career as a value took place.

The general similarity of relationships between occupational status level and the influence and value variables when the choices of first and present jobs are compared seems to lend confidence to the findings. At the same time, the fact that some marked shifts were evident suggests that the answers the respondents gave to questions about their choices of first jobs may have considerable validity. Even though there is undoubtedly some distortion of memory when people are asked about events in the distant past, their answers cannot have been merely a reading back of their present attitudes into the past, since large shifts in values were indicated in the answers. Another fact which argues for the validity of answers concerning the choice of first jobs is that the differences in response patterns of the four status levels were greater with respect to first jobs than with respect to present jobs. It seems probable that if very much blurring of memory had occurred, the four groups of men would have been more alike in discussing their first jobs than in discussing their present jobs, but the opposite of this is what happened.

ACTUAL MOBILITY AND LEVEL OF ASPIRATION

Previous research has shown that a generalized "achievement motive" is correlated with concretely high educational and occupational aspirations. The youth who has internalized a general need to achieve will be more likely to have high occupational ambitions than a similarly situated youth who has not internalized an achievement drive.[16]

---

[16] For relevant studies see several of the articles cited in footnotes 1, 2, and 3 of this chapter, and the following: David C. McClelland, John W. Atkinson, Russell A. Clark, and Edgar L. Lowell, The Achievement Motive, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953;

It would be worthwhile to know whether the kind of achievement motivation which creates high occupational aspirations actually results in occupational success.

Ideally, one should not try to deal with this problem directly without a longitudinal design. We hope we have given at least indirect evidence that one can obtain reasonably accurate information from mature workers about influence on their past occupational decisions; but it is doubtful that workers could give accurate retrospective statements about underlying attitudes such as generalized achievement motivation. Therefore as a second best approach which might give some preliminary leads in this area, we attempted to answer a related though not identical question—whether high present occupational aspirations are related to actual success, with success being defined as intergenerational and career mobility. The results were inconclusive, so we will be brief and give only illustrative findings rather than burden the reader with an elaborate set of negative findings. As we will explain below, we feel that the inconclusiveness of our results is due more to inadequate planning of this part of the research than to inherent defects in the questions we sought to answer.

David C. McClelland, Studies in Motivation, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955; David C. McClelland, Report of Committee on Identification of Talent, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1956; David C. McClelland, Alfred L. Baldwin, Urie Bronfenbrenner, and Fred L. Strodtbeck, Talent and Society, Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1958; Bernard C. Rosen and Roy D'Andrade, "The Psychological Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, 22: 3 (September 1959), pp. 185-218 ; and James V. Pierce and Paul H. Bowman, "Motivation Patterns of Superior High School Students," in The Gifted Student: Research Projects Concerning Elementary and Secondary School Students, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Monograph No. 2, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960, pp. 33-66.

Tables 33 and 34 present data intended to test the hypothesis that workers with high occupational aspirations would tend to have experienced a greater than average amount of upward intergenerational mobility. Tables 35 and 36 do the same, substituting career mobility for intergenerational mobility. The items used to measure occupational aspiration levels were (a) "career" rather than other extrinsic values or nature of work as the occupational value influencing the choice of the present job (in Tables 34 and 36), and (b) the number of affirmative answers to a series of ten questions, each affirmative answer indicating a desire for upward mobility, taken or adapted from questions used in a study by Leonard Reissman.[17] The Reissman items were as follows: "Suppose you were offered a much better job than you now have, or a chance to make a substantial advance in your occupation. Would you go after the better job if it meant (1) endangering your health? (2) moving around the country a lot? (3) moving to a different community? (4) leaving your friends? (5) giving up a lot of leisure time, working longer hours? (6) learning a new type of work? (7) working harder on the job than you do now? (8) taking on new responsibility, more decisions to make? (9) keeping away from your family for some time? (10) keeping quiet about your attitudes toward unions?" To obtain a roughly equal split between high aspirers

---

[17] Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," op. cit. No claim is made by Reissman or by us that these items form a Guttman scale. These were not the only indicators of mobility aspiration which we used, but the tabulations involving these two indicators are presented as illustrative of the kinds of results obtained with all of the indicators of mobility aspiration.

TABLE 33. Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers to Ten Reissman Aspiration Questions, by Time in Labor Force and Intergenerational Mobility

	Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers			
	In Labor Force Less Than 15 Years		In Labor Force More Than 15 Years	
Intergenerational Mobility	N=100%	%	N=100%	%
Upwardly mobile	(70)	65.7	(87)	36.8
Stable	(50)	64.0	(69)	40.6
Downwardly mobile	(32)	46.9	(43)	40.9

TABLE 34. Per Cent Citing Career as Chief Occupational Value Influencing Choice of Present Job, by Time in Labor Force and Intergenerational Mobility

	Per Cent Citing Career as Value			
	In Labor Force Less Than 15 Years		In Labor Force More Than 15 Years	
Intergenerational Mobility	N=100%	%	N=100%	%
Upwardly mobile	(70)	42.9	(90)	44.4
Stable	(50)	50.0	(73)	35.6
Downwardly mobile	(32)	46.9	(45)	31.1

and low aspirers, we dichotomized so that workers answering "yes" to six or more of these ten questions were defined as high aspirers. Tabulations based on those questions are shown in Tables 33 and 35.

Intergenerational mobility and level of aspiration. Table 33 relates intergenerational mobility to level of aspiration as defined by the Reissman questions, with length of time spent in the labor force controlled. The results are essentially negative except that the younger workers had higher aspirations than the older workers. Of the workers who had spent 15 or more years in the labor force, 37 per cent of the upwardly mobile and 41 per cent of the stable and the skidders gave six or more affirmative answers to the Reissman questions. Of the workers who had been in the labor force less than 15 years, not quite two-thirds of the upwardly mobile and the stable, but only 47 per cent of the skidders, gave six or more affirmative answers. From these findings it appears that the older workers tended to have settled down in their jobs while the younger workers hoped to better themselves, as one might expect. The fact that among the younger workers, the intergenerational skidders seemed less ambitious than the upwardly mobile or the stable workers, may be the most significant finding given in Table 33; as will be seen in Table 35, the aspirations of career skidders as measured by the Reissman questions were much higher than those of the intergenerational skidders.[18]

---

[18] Separate tabulations of these relationships for workers currently in IOS levels A, B, C, and D—not shown in Table 33—show that the relationships were not the same in all four status levels. These tabulations are available from Richard L. Simpson. We omit them here because they seem to present no consistent or intelligible over-all pattern.

TABLE 35. Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers to Ten Reissman Aspiration Questions, by Time in Labor Force and Career Mobility

	Per Cent Giving Six or More Yes Answers			
	In Labor Force Less Than 15 Years		In Labor Force More Than 15 Years	
Career Mobility	N=100%	%	N=100%	%
Upwardly mobile	(52)	67.3	(101)	37.6
Stable	(83)	73.5	(88)	39.8
Downwardly mobile	(11)	81.8	(16)	56.3

Table 34 shows the percentages of upwardly mobile, intergenerationally stable, and downwardly mobile workers who cited "career" as the main occupational value influencing the choice of their current jobs. Among the older workers, but not among the younger workers, the upwardly mobile had the highest aspirations by this criterion and the skidders had the lowest aspirations. Among the intergenerationally stable and the skidders, but not among the upwardly mobile, younger workers had higher aspirations than older workers. Because of the exceptions noted, we interpret these findings as not indicating any clear-cut relationship between intergenerational mobility and aspiration level as measured by the naming of "career" as the chief occupational value.

Career mobility and level of aspiration. Table 35 relates career mobility to level of aspiration as defined by the Reissman questions, with length of time spent in the labor force controlled. The higher aspirations of younger workers as measured by the Reissman questions have already been noted. The main new finding shown in Table 35 concerns the career skidders; among both the younger and older workers, the skidders had higher aspirations by this measure than the climbers or the stable workers. This finding is of interest despite the small number of skidders involved (11 of the younger workers and 16 of the older workers), since it was shown earlier than the intergenerational skidders, among the younger workers, had relatively low rather than high aspirations.

Since it seems most unlikely that generalized achievement motivation would be associated with downward career mobility, this

Career mobility and level of aspiration. Table 35 relates career mobility to level of aspiration as defined by the Reissman questions, with length of time spent in the labor force controlled.

finding may provide the key to the largely negative results obtained with these Reissman questions. The tendency for career skidders to answer these questions affirmatively suggests that the questions are measuring dissatisfaction with the workers' current jobs—not necessarily achievement motivation in the usual sense. It stands to reason that a man who has a worse job than the one in which he began his career would be highly dissatisfied with this job and that he would be willing to do many of the things suggested by these questions to improve his lot. It also seems reasonable that this finding did not hold true with respect to intergenerational mobility. The intergenerational skidder may simply be a man with little ambition, who began at a low level and is content to stay at a relatively low level so long as he does not move downward during his career. If these interpretations are correct, the inconsistent findings we obtained with the Reissman questions do not invalidate the hypotheses we began with, though they obviously do not validate them either. The Reissman questions seem to be measuring two different things, achievement drive and dissatisfaction with the current job, and these may or may not coincide in individual cases. This being the case, we made a mistake in trying to measure achievement orientation with these questions. To say this is not to criticize the Reissman study from which we took the questions, for in this study no claim was made that the questions measured generalized achievement motives.

Table 36 shows the percentages of upwardly mobile, career-stable, and downwardly mobile workers for whom "career" was the main occupational value influencing the choice of current jobs. The findings

TABLE 36. Number and Per Cent Citing Career as Chief Occupational Value Influencing Choice of Present Job, by Time in Labor Force and Career Mobility

	Per Cent Citing Career as Value			
	In Labor Force Less Than 15 Years		In Labor Force More Than 15 Years	
Career Mobility	N=100%	%	N=100%	%
Upwardly mobile	(58)	39.7	(105)	42.9
Stable	(91)	48.4	(89)	36.0
Downwardly mobile	(11)	63.6	(17)	17.6

concerning the stable and upwardly mobile are inconclusive, but the career skidders present an interesting pattern. Of all the workers, the younger career skidders had the highest aspirations and the older career skidders had the lowest aspirations as measured by the occupational value question. Apparently the young skidders still hoped to recoup their fortunes while the older skidders had lost hope. These findings, especially for the younger career skidders, are based on small N's, but the percentage differences are rather large, particularly among the older workers.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER 3

1. Among white male adult workers in Raleigh and Burlington-Graham, several variables were found to be related to the status of the first job. Workers whose first jobs were in the white-collar categories (ICS levels A and B) tended to have white-collar fathers, as one would expect. In addition, workers who began their careers in high-status jobs tended to have received career advice from numerous sources; the people whose advice had been most influential in their choice of first jobs were relatively likely to be people outside their own families, mainly prospective supervisors and men already employed in the occupation or at the place of work; and the values they cited as reasons for having chosen their first jobs were relatively likely to pertain to the nature of the work and unlikely to involve extrinsic considerations not related to the work itself. In occupational values related to the choice of first job, the skilled workers (level C) resembled the executives and professionals (level A) more than either

the lower white-collar (B) or lower blue-collar (D) workers did. The percentage of men who indicated some positive attraction to their first jobs was highest in the top status level and lowest in the bottom level, but slightly higher in the upper blue-collar than in the lower white-collar level.

2. Occupational values and sources of advice with respect to the first job were less strongly related to the status of the worker's father than they were to the level of the worker's first job. Values cited as reasons for choosing the first job were only slightly related to sources of advice regarding this job, especially if we consider only those workers who were able to name someone as the main adviser—among these, values were hardly related at all to the type of person named as main adviser. On the basis of these findings it seemed likely that values and sources of occupational advice might have had effects on the status level of the first job, independently of the status of the worker's father, even though father's status clearly had the strongest effect. A test of the hypothesis that father's status, occupational values, and occupational advice had independent and cumulative effects on the level of the first job was therefore undertaken, and the results are summarized below.

3. No matter what values and sources of advice the worker cited as having influenced his choice of a first job, he was far more likely to begin his career in a high-ranking job. if his father held a high-ranking job. Values and advice appear to have had some effect, however, independently of the father's status, at least if the father was a blue-collar worker.

Among workers whose fathers were of blue-collar status, the hypothesis that "nature of work" as an occupational value would be predictive of a high-ranking first job was supported, but the hypothesis was not supported among workers whose fathers were of white-collar status. That the relationship between occupational values and level of first job seemed to depend on the status of the father may indicate that occupational values do not have the same intrinsic meaning at different levels of the socio-economic hierarchy, and that a more sensitive value instrument than the one we used is needed to study the impact of values on occupational choice among boys at different class levels.

The results concerning independent effects of personal influences on first jobs are more clear-cut. With father's status and occupational values controlled, three of four possible comparisons support the hypothesis that the level of the first job will tend to be higher when someone outside the family is the main adviser. The hypothesis is supported in both of the possible comparisons involving sons of blue-collar fathers, and in one of two possible comparisons involving sons of white-collar fathers.

Thus the hypothesis of cumulative effects is supported for workers whose fathers were in manual occupations but not for workers whose fathers were in white-collar occupations. Among working-class boys, the naming of large numbers of advisers and of people outside their families as main advisers, and the citing of "nature of work" as the chief occupational value, all seem to represent knowledge of available job opportunities combined with awareness of the need to seek advice and exercise judgment in choosing an occupation. The negative findings among sons of white-collar workers may mean that they were able to obtain all the advice they needed from their own families, and were in a position to find good jobs no matter what their value orientations toward work might be.

4. Formal vocational counseling in the schools had little effect on the careers of these workers. Fewer than 6 per cent of all the workers and barely more than one-fourth of those who said that their schools had offered counseling were willing to acknowledge any influence of counseling on their own careers. On the basis of other data from an unpublished study, it seems probable that among the minority of workers who attributed influence to vocational counseling, the influence consisted mainly of strengthening the plans they had already made. Nevertheless, there is indirect evidence that counseling may improve workers' career chances by broadening their knowledge of the labor market. The workers most likely to remember whatever counseling their schools may have offered, and most likely to say that counseling had influenced their career decisions, were those whose first jobs were in the lower white-collar group (IOS level B). So few workers attributed influence to counseling that our data on this subject cannot be considered very trustworthy, but the findings suggest that formal vocational counseling has its greatest impact on students from upper blue-collar families who are upwardly mobile into the lower white-collar ranks.

5. The relationships of sources of advice and occupational

values to the levels of present jobs were not the same as the relationships of advice and values to first jobs. In both cases the main adviser was more likely to be someone outside the family if the worker's occupational status was high, but in the case of the present job the percentage of men who did not name any one main adviser was higher and not consistently related to status level. The number of advisers tended to rise with the status of the first job, but with respect to present job the relationship was curvilinear: men with present jobs at levels A and D were relatively likely to name no advisers at all or more than three, while men at present-job levels B and C were relatively likely to name from one to three advisers. In both of these tabulations involving advice and present jobs, the differences between groups were much smaller than in the first-job tabulations—so small that they may represent only sampling variation—but they suggest that men at the top did not need advice and men at the bottom did not know where to get it.

There was a marked shift from the nature of work as a value influencing the choice of first jobs to career considerations as a value influencing the choice of present jobs, especially among the men whose current jobs were at the executive and professional level. A probable reason for the change is that many workers give serious thought to the nature of the work they are entering when they choose their first jobs, and are only dimly aware of the differing possibilities for advancement in various fields; but by the time they are ready to change jobs later on, they are committed to a general type of work and look mainly for advancement within this field.

The substantial and theoretically reasonable differences between the values and sources of advice which workers cited as having influenced their intial and recent job decisions lend confidence to the findings. The shifts over time indicate that responses concerning decisions about first jobs were not merely a reading back of present attitudes into the past, especially since differences in response patterns of the four status levels were greater with respect to first jobs than with respect to present jobs; if much blurring of memory had taken place, one would expect the various groups of workers to be more alike in discussing their first than their present jobs.

6. An attempt was made to test the hypothesis that workers who had experienced upward intergenerational and career mobility would have strong achievement drives. The results were mainly inconclusive, possibly because the questions we used to measure achievement drive were poorly chosen rather than because the hypothesis was invalid.

Our over-all conclusion from the results given in this chapter is that occupational values and sources of advice regarding occupational decisions have an effect on occupational careers which is independent of the worker's social background. This was our initial hypothesis, and it seems to have been supported by the data, at least among workers whose fathers were in manual occupations. The results were inconsistent among workers whose fathers were of high status. Part of the inconsistency in the findings concerning workers of high-status background may be due to the small size of our sample, which shrank alarmingly when extensive cross-tabulations were undertaken. Another part of this inconsistency, however, is probably due to the nature of the phenomena being studied. The findings suggest strongly that more sensitive concepts and survey questions need to be developed for the measurement of occupational values.

CHAPTER 4

SOCIAL ORIGINS, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, AND CAREER PLANS

Earlier studies have shown that distinctive patterns of occupational values and of interpersonal influence are associated with the choice of different kinds of occupations,[1] and the preceding chapter showed similar relationships with respect to the occupational histories of adult workers. This chapter will report some relationships of values and sources of personal influence to the occupational expectations of boys in two high schools.

---

[1] See the references cited in Chapter 3, footnotes 2, 3, and 5, and also the following references which report studies of occupational choice as related to other variables: John B. Edlefsen and Martin Jay Crowe, *Teen-Agers' Occupational Aspirations*, Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 618, July 1960; Herman M. Case, "College as a Factor in Occupational Choice," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 30 (December 1956), pp. 191-199; Herman M. Case and Walter L. Slocum, "Factors Associated with Three Postulated Stages of Occupational Choice Behavior of College Students," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, 21 (September 1953), pp. 242-246; LaMar T. Empey, "Role Expectations of Young Women Regarding Marriage and a Career," *Marriage and Family Living*, 20 (May 1958), pp. 152-155; Archie O. Haller, "The Influence of Planning to Enter Farming on Plans to Attend College," *Rural Sociological Society*, 22 (June 1957), pp. 137-141; E. Grant Youmans, *The Educational Attainment and Future Plans of Kentucky Rural Youths*, Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 664, January 1959; Walter L. Slocum, *Occupational Planning by Undergraduates at the State College of Washington*, Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 547, February 1954; Walter L. Slocum, *Occupational and Educational Plans of High School Seniors from Farm and Non-Farm Homes*, Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 564, February 1956; Walter L. Slocum, "Some Sociological Aspects of Occupational Choice," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 18 (January 1959), pp. 139-147; Walter L. Slocum and LaMar T. Empey, *Occupational Planning by Young Women*, Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 568, August 1956; Murray A Straus, "Personal Characteristics and Functional Needs in the Choice of Farming as an Occupation," *Rural Sociological Society*, 21 (September-December 1956), pp. 257-266; Peter M. Blau, John M. Gustad, Richard Jessor, Herbert S. Parnes, and Richard C. Wilcock, "Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Framework," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 9 (July 1956), pp. 531-543.

The data are from the boys in two high schools who completed questionnaires as described in Chapter 1: 584 boys in High Point and 333 in Wilson, or a total of 917. (Girls are omitted from this analysis.) This sample is considerably reduced by the large number of answers with respect to occupational plans which, while given in good faith, did not include enough information to permit assigning a Hollingshead index of occupational status to the intended occupations. For this reason the N's reported in this chapter are usually between 700 and 800. Various bits of evidence indicate that the respondents omitted from tabulations because of insufficient information about occupational plans are skewed somewhat toward the lower end of the status range, but not markedly so. They are seldom extreme in any respect. Therefore the sample reduction caused by their incomplete answers probably does not distort the findings appreciably.

Separate sections of this chapter will deal with occupational aspirations and three main kinds of related factors: fathers' occupational status levels, occupational values, and sources of personal influence on occupational plans.

LEVELS OF OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION

Table 37 shows the Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status levels of the occupations which the students expected to enter. The question on occupational plans was, "As of right now, what occupation are you planning to take up as your career?" Thus the students were supposedly describing actual plans rather than fantasies, but some of them were plainly doomed to disappointment. More than a third expected to enter the top-ranking occupations in level 1, mainly the professions, and only about a fourth planned to enter manual work.

It is interesting to note that the patterns of expected occupations among the graduating seniors and among the entire group of students--tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders--were almost identical. Probably the similarity is due to the balancing of two counteracting forces, drop-outs and growing realism. Drop-out students nearly all enter the bottom rungs of the occupational ladder, and presumably the expectations of students who intend to drop out soon tend to be rather low. On the other hand, one might expect a growing amount of realism to temper the hopes of some seniors as they approach graduation. We lack information on the number of students who had dropped out of these schools before the twelfth grade. The number appears to have been rather small--about a third of all tenth graders--since our total sample included 234 senior boys as compared with 376 tenth grade boys. If this discrepancy between the number of students in the tenth and twelfth grades adequately reflects the drop-out rate, then the amount of lowering in aspiration levels that occurred as students neared graduation appears to have been smaller than one might have predicted, despite the fact that the questionnaire was administered in May. By this late a time in their senior year, many of the students were within a few weeks of entering the labor force and leaving school forever, yet they still clung to what must often have been unrealistic career expectations.

For purposes of this research, the similarity in expectations of seniors and of students as a whole makes it feasible to use the entire

TABLE 37. IOS Levels of Expected Occupations among Boys in Two High Schools

	Number and Per Cent Planning Occupations in Each Level			
	All Students		Seniors Only	
IOS Level	N	%	N	%
1	(270)	36.1	(67)	34.4
2	(117)	15.6	(39)	20.0
3	(114)	15.2	(22)	11.3
4	(54)	7.2	(18)	9.2
5	(121)	16.2	(33)	16.9
6	(71)	9.5	(15)	7.7
7	(1)	0.1	(1)	0.5
Total	(748)	100.0	(195)	100.0

group of students in analysis rather than the seniors only, thus preserving a fairly large N. Cross-tabulations, some of them given later in this chapter, also show similar patterns among seniors and among the entire group of respondents.

SOME CORRELATES OF FATHER'S STATUS

As one would expect, there was a strong relationship between the occupational status of boys' fathers and the status levels of the occupations they planned to take up. This is shown in Table 38. In this table, and in subsequent tables in this chapter, the seven Hollingshead status levels are combined into two white-collar levels (A and B) and two blue-collar levels (C and D), as in the previous chapters. Only four per cent (3 of 84) of the sons of level-A fathers expected to enter occupations in level D, and this percentage increases steadily until it becomes 18 per cent among the sons of level-D fathers. Conversely, more than 90 per cent of the sons of level-A fathers but only 35 per cent of the sons of level-D fathers expected to have careers in level A. Despite this fairly clear-cut relationship, there was comparatively little difference between the plans of sons of level-C and level-D fathers; the main difference between these groups was that among the boys who planned to enter manual work, the sons of level-C fathers were themselves far more likely than the sons of level-D fathers to plan level-C (skilled) occupations.

Table 39 shows that among the senior boys considered separately, virtually the same relationship held between fathers' status and sons' anticipated status as was found among the entire group of students from the tenth through the twelfth grade. (Compare Tables 38 and 39.)

TABLE 38. Son's Expected Occupation by Father's Occupation

Level of Father's Occupation	Per Cent of Sons Planning Occupations in Each Level A	B	C	D	N=100%
A	90.5	4.8	1.2	3.6	84
B	58.7	25.0	9.8	6.4	264
C	36.1	25.5	27.8	10.6	216
D	35.4	28.3	18.2	18.2	99

TABLE 39. Son's Expected Occupation by Father's Occupation (Seniors Only)

Level of Father's Occupation	Per Cent of Sons Planning Occupations in Each Level A	B	C	D	N=100%
A	88.5	7.7	3.8	0.0	26
B	56.5	24.6	8.7	10.1	69
C	46.0	26.0	24.0	4.0	50
D	45.0	15.0	25.0	15.0	20

The only major difference was that among the sons of blue-collar workers, aspirations tended to be somewhat higher among the twelfth graders. Presumably most students who had dropped out before reaching the twelfth grade had blue-collar fathers and relatively low career expectations. The difference between seniors and other students with blue-collar fathers was not large enough to affect the over-all expectation patterns shown in Table 37.

Two other measures of sons' occupational plans show the same direct relationship to fathers' status levels. The "career groups" of sons' expected occupations, shown in Table 40, are simply another way of classifying their answers to the question which asked what occupations they planned to take up. Sons of level-A fathers tended to plan professional careers and were unlikely to plan manual careers, while the sons of manual workers were slightly more likely to plan manual than professional careers, with sons of level-B fathers intermediate. Among the respondents who did not plan either professional or manual careers, the tendency was for sons of higher-status fathers to plan business careers and for sons of lower-status fathers to plan "other white-collar" careers such as clerical and sales work below the managerial level.

Thus the relation between intended career group and father's status was direct, except that the career-group plans of sons of level-C and level-D manual fathers were almost identical. Table 41 shows a direct relationship between father's status and son's anticipated income, with the sons of level-C and level-D fathers this time differing more sharply from each other.

Table 42 further confirms the picture of higher career expectations among the sons of higher-status fathers. The higher the status of a boy's

TABLE 40. Son's Expected Career Group by Father's Occupation *

Level of Father's Occupation	Per Cent of Sons Planning Careers in Each Group Professional	Business	Other White Collar	Manual	Glamorous	N=100%
A	78.6	15.5	1.2	4.8	0.0	84
B	55.6	12.4	11.7	16.2	3.0	266
C	35.0	9.7	13.8	38.2	3.2	217
D	33.3	7.1	17.2	38.4	4.0	99

* Career groups were defined as follows:

Professional: includes major and minor professions, whether independent or salaried.

Business: independent proprietors, salaried managers, and managerial-level sales personnel.

Other White Collar: sales personnel below managerial level; clerical workers; sub-professional and semi-professional technicians.

Manual: excludes farm (but there were no respondents who expected to be farmers or farm workers); includes service workers below professional level.

Glamorous: e.g., model, actress, professional athlete, pilot.

TABLE 41. Son's Expected Yearly Income by Father's Occupation

Level of Father's Occupation	Per Cent Expecting Each Income				
	$5,000 or less	$5,000-$7,000	$7,000-$10,000	Over $10,000	N=100%
A	13.5	16.9	13.5	56.2	89
B	31.2	19.9	19.6	29.2	301
C	46.4	23.0	14.3	16.3	252
D	56.4	15.5	16.4	11.8	110

TABLE 42. Son's College Plans and High School Curriculum by Father's Occupation

Son's Plans and Curriculum	Level of Father's Occupation (%) A	B	C	D
a. College Plans				
Don't plan to go	2.1	12.5	28.1	37.7
I may and I may not	8.5	20.1	33.1	23.0
Will go if can afford	8.5	12.5	17.5	23.0
Definitely plan to go	80.9	54.9	21.3	16.4
N=100%	94	328	263	122
b. High School Curriculum				
Academic	88.3	72.3	39.6	35.0
Other	11.7	27.7	60.4	65.0
N=100%	94	325	260	120

father, the more likely he was to plan to attend college (Part a of the table), and the more likely he was to be enrolled in the academic (college preparatory) curriculum (Part b). Other curricula, where the lower-status students tended to congregate, were called general, vocational (industrial arts or agriculture), and commercial.

Table 43 shows a tendency for the sons of higher-status fathers to have first thought about their intended occupations at earlier ages (Part a) and to describe themselves as experiencing less difficulty in choosing occupations (Part b), though the differences were rather small. The questions asked were: (a) "How old were you when you first thought about going into the kind of work you now expect to go into?" (b) "Are you having much trouble in deciding what will be your career?" About 60 per cent of the sons of level-A fathers and fewer than half the sons of blue-collar fathers had first thought about their expected occupations at the age of 14 or less, but this relationship was not entirely consistent, since the sons of level-D fathers were slightly more likely than the sons of level-C fathers to have done so. In the amount of difficulty they were having in choosing careers, the sons of fathers in levels B, C, and D were substantially alike and only the sons of level-A fathers revealed a distinctive pattern: these high-status sons were having less difficulty than the others.

These last findings are not clear-cut enough to support any firm conclusions, but they seem to bespeak the easier access to occupational knowledge and advice which boys have who grow up in favored circumstances. This interpretation is somewhat borne out by the relationships between

TABLE 43. Age When Son First Thought about Expected Occupation, and Difficulty in Deciding on Career, by Father's Occupation

	Level of Father's Occupation (%)			
Son's Thought and Difficulty	A	B	C	D
a. Age at Which Son First Thought about Expected Occupation				
14 or younger	59.8	51.2	43.7	46.9
15 or older	40.2	48.8	56.3	53.1
N=100%	87	291	245	113
b. Amount of Trouble in Deciding on Career				
A lot of trouble	14.9	23.2	22.0	25.8
Some trouble	52.1	61.0	59.1	55.8
No trouble at all	33.0	15.9	18.9	18.3
N=100%	94	328	264	120

father's status and sources of occupational advice. High-status sons were somewhat more likely to have received occupational advice from numerous sources, though this relationship was neither strong nor wholly consistent (Table 44). They were more likely to say that their fathers had suggested some occupation to them, and the occupations suggested by high-status parents were mainly professional (Table 45).

The occupational advice given (or not given) by mothers and by fathers (Table 45) presents some interesting contrasts. Fathers' advice was directly related to their occupational status: the higher the status, the more likely the father was to have suggested some occupation, and the more likely the occupation was to be professional. The mother, however, was most likely to have suggested an occupation if the father's status was at one of the middle levels, B or C, and least likely to have given advice if the father's status was at level A or D. Another difference was that only about half as many mothers as fathers had suggested manual occupations; more mothers than fathers in every father's status level except A had suggested professional occupations, even though fewer mothers than fathers had made some kind of suggestion. This suggests the hypothesis that the father is more likely to give concretely helpful suggestions regarding specific occupational careers, but the mother is more likely to spur her son to ambition.[2] It should be borne in mind, however, that

---

[2] Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (Summer 1953), pp. 186-203, presents evidence that in working-class families, the mother is very likely to urge a son to attend college and aim for white-collar work.

TABLE 44. Number of Advisers of Son by Father's Occupation

Number of Types of Adviser *	Level of Father's Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
1	12.1	17.4	15.7	18.1
2	30.8	30.5	40.2	34.5
3	57.1	51.7	44.1	47.4
N=100%	91	321	254	116

* The questionnaire format was such that "no advisers" could not be distinguished from "no answer," but very few respondents failed to check one or more advisers.

TABLE 45. Career Suggestions of Father and Mother by Father's Occupation

Parents' Suggestions	Level of Father's Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
a. Father's Suggestion				
Professional	37.6	28.9	17.4	11.6
Other white collar	8.2	12.3	5.4	5.4
Manual	2.4	3.0	14.9	12.5
Did not suggest any	51.8	55.8	62.4	70.5
N=100%	85	301	242	112
b. Mother's Suggestion				
Professional	29.8	31.2	20.7	16.7
Other white collar	3.6	5.4	11.0	5.3
Manual	0.0	2.7	7.6	6.1
Did not suggest any	66.7	60.7	60.8	71.9
N=100%	84	295	237	114

fewer than half of either the mothers or fathers in any of the four status groups had suggested any specific occupation.

The finding that higher-status fathers were more likely than lower-status fathers to have suggested occupations to these high school boys might seem to contradict the finding, reported in the previous chapter, that the "main adviser" was unlikely to have been a family member among workers entering the labor force at the higher job levels. Actually the two findings are not contradictory, but this finding from the high school questionnaires reinforces one of the conclusions drawn in the last chapter. If in the upper status groups the main adviser is likely to be someone outside the family, even though the father is relatively likely to give some advice, it is plain that boys in higher social classes have access to a wider variety of occupational information than is available to lower-class boys.

Summary: correlates of father's status. There was a strong relationship in the expected direction between fathers' occupational statuses and the statuses of the occupations planned by their sons. This pattern was almost exactly the same among the twelfth-grade boys as among the entire group of students in all three high-school grades. The higher the status of the father, the more likely the son was to plan a high-status occupational career, to plan a professional rather than business, other white collar, or manual career, to expect a high income ten years after finishing school, to plan to attend college, and to be enrolled in the college preparatory curriculum.

Other variables were less strongly and less consistently related to father's status. There was some tendency for sons of high-status fathers, more than sons of low-status fathers, to have first considered the occupations they currently planned to enter when they were 14 or younger, to be experiencing little difficulty in deciding on occupations, to have received advice from numerous sources including their fathers (but not necessarily their mothers), and to have been advised by their parents to enter professions rather than other kinds of occupations. The relation between father's status and likelihood that the mother had suggested some occupation was not a consistent one. Fathers were about twice as likely as mothers to have suggested manual occupations; when the mothers had given advice, the suggested occupations were very likely to be professional.

CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION AND PLANNING FOR COLLEGE

In the section just concluded, students were classified by the status of their fathers' jobs. In the remainder of the chapter, they are classified by the status of the occupations they expected to enter.

Table 46 shows, for boys planning occupations in the four different status levels, the ages at which they first thought about their currently intended occupations and the amount of difficulty they were having in choosing careers. With respect to the age at which they first considered their expected occupations, there is an interesting difference from what was found when this variable was examined in relation to father's status (Table 43). The higher the father's status, the more likely the boy was to have considered his expected occupation when he was 14 or less, with only a slight reversal between boys whose fathers were at levels C and D; but while a similar positive relationship between son's expected occupational status and early consideration of his occupation held for boys planning careers at levels A, B, and C, there was a very substantial reversal of the relationship among boys planning level-D occupations. The "D-planners" along with the "A-planners" had thought about their expected careers considerably earlier than either the B- or C-planners had. This is a puzzling finding and we have no explanation for it. It can be seen in Table 38 (reading N's down rather than across) that the B- and C-planners were more likely than the A- or D-planners to have fathers in the same levels as those they expected to enter. From this we would have expected them to consider their planned occupations earlier, not later, than the others did.

Part b of the same table (46) shows that the A-planners were having less difficulty in deciding on their occupations than the other boys were. No particular relationship seemed to exist between level of expected occupation and difficulty of decision among the boys planning careers in levels B, C, and D. The relative ease of decision among A-planners may reflect the well-known and prestigeful nature of the occupations in level A. Once a person has decided that he can be a lawyer, pharmacist, or business executive--to name three illustrative level-A occupations--one would expect him to be rather enthusiastic about his choice; but the boy who expects to become a clerk, traveling salesman, or manual laborer may well be assailed by doubts. The decision to plan a lower-ranking occupational career may often be a realistic compromise

TABLE 46. Age When Respondent First Thought about Expected Occupation, and Difficulty in Deciding on Career, by Level of Expected Occupation

Age and Difficulty	Level of Expected Occupation (%) A	B	C	D
a. Age at Which Respondent First Thought about Expected Occupation				
14 or younger	56.3	40.9	36.8	47.2
15 or older	43.7	59.1	63.2	52.8
N=100%	380	164	117	72
b. Amount of Trouble in Deciding on Career				
A lot of trouble	15.0	21.0	21.5	23.6
Some trouble	55.0	61.1	66.9	59.7
No trouble at all	30.0	18.0	11.6	16.7
N=100%	387	167	121	72

with one's early ambitions, or it may mean only that such a career is known to be available and possible.

Table 47 shows that the high aspirers were much more likely than the low aspirers to have plans to attend college (Part a), to be enrolled in the college preparatory curriculum (b), and to expect high incomes 10 years after beginning work (c). The differences were large, and these findings lend some credibility to the students' statements about their expectations despite a certain amount of overoptimism. They seemed to know what was involved and to answer the separate questions rather consistently with each other, so that the student who planned a low-status occupation was unlikely to expect a big income, and the student not enrolled in the college preparatory curriculum was unlikely to have high occupational or income expectations.

OCCUPATIONAL VALUES AND OCCUPATIONAL PLANS

So far it has been shown that the occupational status of the fathers explained much of the variation in occupational levels in which the sons expected to make their careers. Chapter 3 showed that occupational values and interpersonal influence also had some relationship to career patterns, independently of fathers' status. In this section and the one following, we shall see whether values and personal influence were related to the occupational plans of these high school boys.

Table 48 shows the reasons cited by boys planning careers at the four occupational levels for having chosen their expected occupations. The question asked was open-ended. After indicating what occupations they planned to take up, the respondents were asked, "What would you like better

TABLE 47. College Plans, High School Curriculum, and Expected Yearly Income by Level of Expected Occupation

College Plans, Curriculum and Expected Income	Level of Expected Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
a. College Plans				
Don't plan to go	0.8	19.0	61.2	59.7
I may and I may not	12.2	32.1	28.9	27.8
Will go if can afford	20.7	22.6	6.6	8.3
Definitely plan to go	66.3	26.2	3.3	4.2
N=100%	386	168	121	72
b. High School Curriculum				
Academic	85.2	44.6	14.3	19.1
Other	14.8	55.4	85.7	80.9
N=100%	384	168	119	68
c. Expected Yearly Income				
$5,000 or less	18.5	41.8	68.4	82.6
$5,000 - $7,000	21.7	25.9	18.4	13.0
$7,000 - $10,000	23.1	15.8	4.4	1.4
Over $10,000	36.7	16.5	8.8	2.9
N=100%	373	158	114	69

about this kind of work than about some other kind?" The reasons given were coded as (a) intrinsic (aspects of the work itself), (b) altruism (serve mankind, help other people, do some good in the world, etc.), (c) money, prestige, or glamor. The boys aspiring to different statuses did not differ in any consistent fashion. Nearly all of them in all four groups (74 to 85 per cent) cited intrinsic reasons for choosing their occupations, with money or prestige mentioned next most often and altruism mentioned least often.

These findings are somewhat in contrast to the results of some earlier studies,[3] which have shown fairly large numbers of students giving altruistic reasons for occupational choice, especially among those aspiring to high-level work, substantially fewer students giving intrinsic reasons, and somewhat more giving "extrinsic-reward" reasons such as money and prestige. The difference may reflect the fact that the other studies cited involved college students rather than high school students: perhaps students choose general fields on the basis of intrinsic factors, but as their choices become more crystallized during college, they begin to think more about the humanitarian service and extrinsic rewards which are possible in their chosen occupations. However, it has been found that in at least some occupations, the work may be initially

---

[3] For example, Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957; Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (December 1960), pp. 116-125; Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Values and Occupational Choice." Social Forces, 39 (December 1960), pp. 126-135.

TABLE 48. Reason for Choosing Occupation by Level of Expected Occupation

Reason for Choosing Occupation	Level of Expected Occupation (%) A	B	C	D
Intrinsic	74.4	79.9	84.5	76.2
Altruistic	10.4	3.5	2.1	9.5
Money or prestige	15.2	16.7	13.4	14.3
N=100%	336	144	97	42

chosen as an avenue for humanitarian service, and only later--during college or professional training--will the students begin to emphasize intrinsic features of the work as rewards.[4] Thus we are left without a firmly grounded explanation of the difference between the present findings and those of earlier studies. It is of course possible that the difference is merely an artifact of the research instruments used, since some of the earlier studies provided pre-coded responses for students to check, but we only gave them a blank space in which to write answers.

Table 49 shows essentially similar findings for the seniors considered separately, although among seniors the differences between groups were somewhat greater: instead of 74 per cent, 67 per cent of the senior A-planners cited intrinsic reasons, and instead of 85 per cent, 93 per cent of the senior C-planners cited intrinsic reasons. It may be of interest that among both seniors and the student bodies as a whole, the boys who planned careers in level C--the skilled manual occupations--had the greatest tendency to give intrinsic reasons for choosing their work. This may mean that, once a boy has decided that his career will be in manual work, the nature of work tasks rather than monetary or prestige considerations is likely to be the reason if he aspires to skilled rather than semiskilled or unskilled work. About 20 per cent in all groups of

---

[4] For example, Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer, "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," *American Sociological Review*, 23 (February 1958), pp. 50-56; Ida Harper Simpson, "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, 1960.

TABLE 49. Reason for Choosing Occupation by Level of Expected Occupation (Seniors Only)

Reason for Choosing Occupation	Level of Expected Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
Intrinsic	67.0	76.5	92.6	77.8
Altruistic	12.5	2.9	0.0	0.0
Money or prestige	20.5	20.6	7.4	22.2
N=100%	88	34	27	9

seniors except the C-planners gave money or prestige as reasons for occupational choice (more often prestige at the upper levels and money at the lower levels). Altruism had almost disappeared as a reason for choice among the seniors except among those planning level-A careers; only one B-planner and no one planning for manual work gave an altruistic reason for having chosen his expected occupation. Despite the differences noted between seniors and other students, the general similarity of the patterns gives some confirmation to our earlier decision that analysis can concentrate on the entire student body rather than proceed separately for seniors and other students.

Table 50 shows the "importance of occupational features" as indicated by students planning careers at the four different levels. The question on which these figures are based was, "Below are four things about an occupation, each of which might have something to do with how satisfied a person would be with that occupation. We should like to know how important you think each of these things is. Please write a '1' by the feature you think most important . . ." The four features listed were (a) interesting and challenging work; (b) plenty of money and prestige; (c) security and stability (steady work); (d) service to humanity, chance to help people.

The main finding is a fairly direct relationship between high aspiration and tendency to name "interesting and challenging work" as the most important occupational feature: 40 per cent of the A-planners but only 23 per cent of the D-planners named this feature as most important, with B- and C-planners in between. Almost identical percentages (between 7 and 8 per cent) of the four groups of boys named money and prestige as the

TABLE 50. Occupational Feature Ranked First in Importance, by Level of Expected Occupation

Occupational Feature	Level of Expected Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
Interesting and challenging work	40.1	33.3	32.0	23.4
Plenty of money and prestige	7.1	7.4	7.8	7.8
Security and stability (steady work)	24.1	39.5	37.9	37.5
Serve humanity, help people	28.7	19.8	22.3	31.3
N=100%	352	162	103	64

most important feature. Not quite 40 per cent in each group named "security" as the most important feature, except among the A-planners, only 24 per cent of whom ranked this feature first; this may mean that many boys with aspirations this high took "steady work" for granted and therefore did not evaluate prospective careers on this basis. Roughly 30 per cent of the A- and D-planners but only about 20 per cent of the B- and C-planners named humanitarian service as the most important occupational feature; a number of level-A jobs involving work with people provide an opportunity to gratify this service motive, but we have no explanation this clear of the prevalence of the service orientation among the boys planning level-D careers. Perhaps they were simply hard put to think of reasons why anyone would really want to do the kinds of work they expected to do--a depressing but plausible tentative explanation.

Table 51 relates expected occupational level to answers to two questions from an intended five-item "ambition scale" which did not scale satisfactorily. The two questions were statements with which the respondents could "definitely agree," "somewhat agree," "somewhat disagree," or "definitely disagree"; no neutral or zero-point response category was provided. The statements were: (a) "If a young person is ambitious, he will usually not let anything keep him from getting ahead." (b) "If you try to do a job, and find it hard, there's no use to keep plugging at it." Unexpectedly, in comparison with boys planning blue-collar careers, the boys planning white-collar careers were more likely not to "definitely agree" that an ambitious person will let nothing stand in his way. As expected, the boys aspiring to higher-ranking occupations showed

TABLE 51. Agreement with Two Statements Related to Ambition, by Level of Expected Occupation

Statement and Degree of Agreement	Level of Expected Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
a. "If a young person is ambitious, he will usually not let anything keep him from getting ahead."				
Definitely agree	58.3	56.0	68.3	66.7
Somewhat agree	27.6	31.3	20.8	22.2
Somewhat or definitely disagree	14.1	12.7	10.8	11.1
N=100%	384	166	120	72
b. "If you try to do a job, and find it hard, there's no use to keep plugging at it."				
Definitely or somewhat agree	6.8	11.9	16.7	18.1
Somewhat disagree	15.6	21.4	21.7	19.4
Definitely disagree	77.6	66.7	61.7	62.5
N=100%	384	168	120	72

the greatest tendency to "definitely disagree" that there is "no use to keep plugging at it" if a task proves hard; but the differences between groups, while generally in the expected direction, were slight. Together the results of these two questions are not very clear-cut, and the same is true of the results of the three other questions meant to measure ambition.

Summary: occupational values and occupational plans. Boys expecting to have occupational careers in levels A, B. C, and D did not differ markedly or in a consistent direction in the reasons they gave for having chosen their intended occupations; regardless of the level of expectation, most boys cited some intrinsic aspect of their expected work as the main reason for having chosen it. While intrinsic reasons were the main ones given by aspirants to all four levels, this tendency was most marked among boys planning skilled manual careers and least marked among boys planning level-A (executive and professional) careers; this latter difference was more pronounced among seniors than among other students, but the general pattern was the same among seniors as among all students.

When the students were asked what feature of an occupation might make a person most satisfied with it, the main finding was a fairly direct relationship between high occupational aspiration and the tendency to name "interesting and challenging work" as the most important occupational feature.

Two items meant to measure "ambition" produced inconsistent results. Blue-collar aspirants appeared more ambitious according to one question but white-collar aspirants according the other, and in neither case were the differences between groups large.

All things considered, these value items did not discriminate very well between the boys expecting careers in levels A, B, C, and D. Certainly their predictive power was far less than that of father's occupational status. The inconsistent results of this section of the high school questionnaire would not seem to justify any attempt to analyze cumulative effects of father's status and occupational values as was done in Chapter 3.

PERSONAL INFLUENCE AND OCCUPATIONAL PLANS

Tables 52 through 54 relate sources of occupational advice to the status levels of the occupations in which these high-school boys expected to make their careers.

Table 52 shows that there was some over-all tendency for high aspirers to have had advice from more sources, but a reversal of this relationship occurs in that the D-planners were more likely than the C-planners to have talked to three or more types of people about their occupational plans. This information is based on the question, "Which of the people listed below have you already talked to about what you want to do for your career? Check as many or as few as you want." The categories of advisers listed were mother, father, other relatives, friends, teachers, people in the occupation you expect to take up, and others. These categories were combined in analysis into three types: relatives including parents, friends, and all others. It was shown in Chapter 3 that workers entering the labor force in high-ranking occupations were likely to have had advice from numerous sources, and the high-school

TABLE 52. Number of Advisers by Level of Expected Occupation

Number of Types of Adviser *	Level of Expected Occupation (%) A	B	C	D
1	8.9	16.5	18.3	22.1
2	30.6	32.9	45.0	33.8
3	60.5	50.6	36.7	45.6
N=100%	382	164	120	69

* The questionnaire format was such that "no advisers" could not be distinguished from "no answer," but very few respondents failed to check one or more advisers.

findings are consistent with those of Chapter 3 except for the reversal of the relationship among the D-planners. One can only speculate as to the meaning of this reversal. Perhaps when a boy who expects to begin in unskilled or semiskilled work "talks to someone" about his intended "career," the talk often represents an actual job offer to begin when he finishes school, but when a boy who has hopes of becoming a skilled worker "talks to" someone it means that he is seeking general advice about career possibilities, since it is less likely that anyone would make a definite offer or suggestion of a skilled job to a boy still in high school.

Table 53 shows the relationship of the same two factors, status level of expected occupation and number of types of advice sources, among the seniors only. The relationship can only be described as bizarre. Boys planning occupations in levels A, B, and D were almost identical, the percentages in these groups who named all three types of advisers (relatives, friends, others) being 71, 73, and 73 among aspirants to levels A, B, and D, respectively. The C-planners, however, were vastly different. Of these boys who expected to pursue skilled manual careers, fewer than 40 per cent named all three types of advisers. We have no explanation at all for this finding, which is unexpected and is inconsistent with the findings from the interviews reported in Chapter 3.

Table 54 gives data on advice given by fathers (Part a) and mothers (Part b). Part a shows some relationship between high occupational aspiration and the likelihood that the father had given advice: 73 per cent of the D-planners but only 55 per cent of the A-planners reported that

TABLE 53. Number of Advisers by Level of Expected Occupation (Seniors Only)

Number of Types of Adviser *	Level of Expected Occupation (%) A	B	C	D
1 or 2	29.2	27.5	60.6	26.7
3	70.8	72.5	39.4	73.3
N=100%	106	40	33	15

* The questionnaire format was such that "no advisers" could not be distinguished from "no answer," but very few respondents failed to check one or more advisers.

TABLE 54. Career Suggestions of Father and Mother by Level of Expected Occupation

Parents' Suggestions	Level of Expected Occupation (%)			
	A	B	C	D
a. Father's Suggestion				
Professional	38.5	9.9	7.3	3.1
Other white collar	5.5	19.9	4.6	7.8
Manual	1.1	6.6	29.4	15.6
Did not suggest any	54.9	63.6	58.7	73.4
N=100%	348	151	109	64
b. Mother's Suggestion				
Professional	36.8	15.8	12.0	20.9
Other white collar	3.7	17.8	6.5	10.4
Manual	1.1	3.3	14.8	9.0
Did not suggest any	58.4	63.2	66.7	59.7
N=100%	356	152	108	67

their fathers had not suggested any occupations to them, and the B- and C-planners were intermediate in this respect. More interesting is the fact that the C-planners were more like the A-planners than the B-planners were—a slight reversal of the general relationship. Thus the boys planning skilled manual careers, like the ones planning professional or executive careers, were relatively likely to have received occupational advice from their fathers. Moreover, when we compare the C-planners and D-planners who had received suggestions from their fathers, we find that the C-planners' fathers were slightly more likely to have suggested manual rather than white-collar occupations--the opposite of what one might have expected in view of the fact that the C-planners' fathers tended themselves to be of slightly higher status than the D-planners' fathers (see Table 38). Of the 32 C-planners' fathers who had suggested specific manual occupations, 29 had suggested skilled occupations; 14 of these 29 fathers were themselves skilled manual workers.

Part b of Table 54 shows that the pattern of mothers' suggestions was different from that of fathers' suggestions. Except for the D-planners, there was a slight positive relationship between high aspiration and tendency for the mother to have suggested an occupation. Mothers of D-planners, however, were about as likely as the mothers of A-planners, and more likely than the mothers of B- and C-planners, to have made suggestions. It has been noted in an earlier section that the mothers tended to recommend higher-ranking work than the fathers, and this tendency was especially pronounced among the mothers of D-planners. More than half the mothers' suggestions to D-planners had involved level-A work, and only the A-planners had a higher percentage of mothers suggesting leveled work. Even though a higher percentage of D-planners' mothers than of C-planners' mothers had made any kind of suggestion, relatively fewer of the former (9 per cent) than of the latter (15 per cent) had advised their sons to do manual work. In the typical case the mother, especially in the lowest social class, seems to have been more ambitious for her son but the father more realistic. Perhaps some of these mothers of D-planners were trying to talk their sons out of leaving school early for low-ranking jobs.

Summary: personal influence and occupational plans. Among the entire group of students—tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders—there was some over-all tendency for boys with high-status expectations to have received occupational advice from more sources. An exception to this is that boys planning semiskilled or unskilled careers tended to have received slightly more advice than those planning skilled labor as a career. Among the seniors considered separately, however, there was almost no difference in the amounts of advice received by the four groups except that the boys who expected to do skilled work were barely more than half as likely as the others to have received advice from all three possible types of sources (parents and other relatives, friends, and others).

Except among the boys who expected to do semiskilled and unskilled (level-D) work, a higher percentage of fathers than of mothers had suggested specific occupations to their sons. When the parents did make suggestions, the fathers were far more likely than the mothers to suggest manual work.

Most of the suggested manual occupations were skilled, and the fathers of boys who were planning to do skilled work were especially likely to have suggested occupations of this kind; probably these suggestions had often been influential in the boys' choice of skilled labor as a career, though from our data we cannot know this for sure. An unexpectedly high percentage of the boys who expected to do work below the skilled-labor level reported that their mothers had suggested occupations to them, and an unexpectedly high percentage of these suggestions were for professional work. In the absence of relevant data we can only speculate as to why this was, but perhaps some of these mothers were alarmed by their sons' intentions to leave school early and do low-ranking work, and were trying to dissuade them from doing this.

It is hard to avoid concluding that these findings on advice as related to occupational expectations do not show very much. Our initial hypothesis, which the findings on adult workers reported in the previous chapter supported, was that access to numerous sources of advice would be associated with plans to enter high-ranking occupations. The data supported this hypothesis more nearly than its opposite, but the percentage differences between groups were usually small and never consistently in the same direction.

Since the hypotheses concerning occupational values and personal influence as correlates of the level of expected occupational careers were not clearly or consistently supported, we are left with father's occupational status as the only one of our variables which satisfactorily predicts the son's occupational expectations. Two tentative conclusions may be drawn. One is that the hypotheses were a bit too simple for the phenomena they were meant to explain; not occupational status as a simple linear phenomenon, but specific life styles and experiences which differ from stratum to stratum and from occupational type to occupational type in subtle ways, may hold the key to explaining occupational choice and aspiration.

The other conclusion is that there may be a certain unreality in trying to study occupational choice among high school boys with standard survey procedures using pre-coded questionnaires. Very few of these boys really have any clear notion of what they intend to do in life, and very few have systematically considered alternative occupations in a way that would give genuine meaning to their answers to questions like those we asked about occupational values and sources of occupational advice. For this reason even the "advice" questions, which produced fairly fruitful results in the interviews with adult workers, along with the value questions, which worked somewhat less well with the adult workers but still better than they did with the high school boys, were asking many of the boys to do something they were not equipped to do. They could not give well thought out answers to questions on their occupational planning, since what planning they had done in many cases was quite vague. This is not to say that their answers were pure fantasy, for there is evidence that they had given some thought to the matter. Our findings taken as a whole do suggest, however, in conjunction with findings of other studies using college students as subjects, that planning of an occupational career does not become very concrete or systematic until the person is at the point of making an actual decision. This decision may involve the first full-time job he takes, as in the case of most of the adult workers we interviewed, or it may take the form of choosing a course of study in college. When the individual faces the actual need to choose a job or occupation, he listens to advice and brings his basic values to bear on the decision.

APPENDIX A

THE RESEARCH PROPOSAL

This appendix will reproduce the original proposal submitted to the Office of Education, on the basis of which funds were provided for the major portion of the study. Unnecessary details are omitted; specifically, the omissions include sections of the original proposal entitled "expected end-product and publication plans," "personnel," "facilities," "duration," and "budget." Basic deviations from the early plans embodied in the proposal will be described in lettered footnotes.

I. Project Title.

Occupational Choice and Mobility in the Urbanizing Piedmont of North Carolina.

II. Problem.

Substantial evidence exists that the processes through which individuals select and pursue work careers involve great waste of talent and a high amount of personal and social disorganization. People fail to take advantage of available opportunities, or they migrate long distances when opportunities exist close at hand. Communities educate their youth only to lose them in their productive years, or they educate them for the wrong careers in view of the opportunities available locally. Workers enter occupations ill suited to them, and shift from one job to another at great loss to themselves and society. People with high ability fail to seize opportunities which would tap their potentialities.

Career choice is as crucial a decision as anyone makes, yet it is relatively unstudied. Psychologists have studied the influence of personality on occupational choice, but the social and cultural factors influencing this decision remain largely unexplored. Sociologists have begun to study career patterns, but their concepts and measuring techniques have been relatively crude. Counselors and other educators will be handicapped in dealing with occupational placement until more is known about the social and cultural factors which affect career patterns.

The proposed research will seek to test and formulate hypotheses regarding social and cultural factors which influence occupational decisions and career patterns. The research design views workers' social origins, reference group orientations, and value orientations as influences upon vertical occupational mobility. Vertical mobility is postulated to be, in part, the outcome of decisions made by workers before and during their adult work careers. Both intergenerational mobility (son's occupational level relative to father's occupational level) and career mobility (changes in occupational level during the career of the individual) will be examined.

The North Carolina Piedmont seems an excellent locale for such a study. The region is undergoing steady urbanization and industrial diversification. These social changes are imposing new decisions on the youth who must plan work careers, and on the educators who must formulate programs to meet changing conditions. At the same time, the findings will be generalizable to other settings, since the research will deal with the kinds of processes which occur wherever people choose and pursue work careers. The results should thus be of value to vocational counselors, educational administrators, and social scientists.

III. Objectives.

The hypotheses below are an illustrative but not exhaustive list.

A. Hypotheses involving reference group orientations. Orientations of individuals toward three kinds of reference groups will be explored: influence groups, who give advice or information; identification groups, whom the individual would like to join or resemble; and approval groups, whose approval the individual desires. In some cases these groups may coincide; in other cases they may not.[a] Illustrative hypotheses follow.[b]

---

[a] For the reasons explained in footnote 6, Chapter 3, these distinctions between types of reference groups did not prove to be fruitful in the analysis, and the results reported in this document deal only with "influence groups," usually referred to simply as "advisers" or as "sources of personal influence." Approval and influence groups as initially defined and operationalized seemed to be very nearly the same thing, judging from results in preliminary analysis. Attempts to devise a valid measure of identification group orientation for the interviews with adult workers were not successful. Some of the items in the high school questionnaire given in Appendix C, mainly question 61, were intended to get at identification group orientations, but preliminary analysis of the results obtained were not very enlightening and the concept of identification group orientation was therefore dropped from the analysis of the high school data.

[b] Data were collected for the testing of these hypotheses, but in some cases where the results were essentially negative or the hypotheses seemed ill-chosen on the basis of the findings, explicit tests are not reported. In some other cases, tests of the hypotheses are reported but different wording is used in order to make the findings as a whole fit together better and be more useful. A slavish and mechanical adherence to these hypotheses and their initial wording would have closed out the possibility of devoting time and resources to what seemed, on the basis of field experience and actual confrontation of the data, to be more fruitful though related lines of inquiry. It was sometimes necessary to choose between literal adherence to the original proposal and maximum meaningfulness of analysis in the spirit of the proposal, and we generally chose the latter.

1. The higher the occupational level of a person's father, the more likely he is to use his family as an influence, identification, and approval group when choosing an occupation.

2. Youths who use peers as their major reference groups will tend to be intergenerationally mobile toward the occupational level of their peers, whether this be higher or lower than their fathers' occupational levels.

3. Individuals who use parents as approval groups, and teachers or other adult authorities as influence and approval groups, will tend to be upwardly mobile.

4. Individuals with strong orientations toward identification and approval groups are more likely to exhibit upward mobility—both intergenerational and career—than are individuals who lack such strong orientations.

5. The youths most likely to use teachers and counselors as influence and approval groups will be upwardly mobile youths from the lower classes. Youths from the higher social classes will be more likely to seek advice and approval from others, such as their parents, whose status is higher then that of the school personnel.

B. Hypotheses involving value orientations. These hypotheses are in part stimulated by the work of Rosen, Rosenberg, and Parsons, cited below under IV, "Other Related Research." Rosen finds that middle-class adolescents show more "achievement orientation" than do lower-class adolescents, but his data do not indicate whether these differences are later reflected in different rates of occupational mobility. Rosenberg presents a typology of occupational value orientations: extrinsic-reward values such as the desire for money and prestige, people-oriented values such as the desire for friendly colleagueship or the wish to serve others, and self-expression values such as the desire to use one's talents. Parsons' instrumental-expressive behavior dimension is another potentially useful value typology.[e] Illustrative hypotheses follow.

1. High upward mobility is associated with high achievement value orientation, low self-expression work orientation, low people-orientation, high extrinsic-reward orientation, and a generally instrumental rather than expressive goal orientation.

2. Manual workers tend mainly toward extrinsic-reward values (primarily related to security) and people-oriented values (primarily related to on-the-job social relations) regarding their work. Other value orientations are found mainly in the higher occupational strata. (Stated differently: Typologies of this kind are meaningful only in the higher strata, where more alternatives are available.)

---

[e] The typology of values on which we settled was nature of work vs. career orientation vs. other extrinsic values. The typology is discussed, and the items on which it is based are given, in Chapter 3. The typology was derived from a longer list of values adapted from those used at Cornell by Rosenberg and others, but it differs from Rosenberg's own typology.

3. The higher the occupational level of a person's father, the more likely he is to seek self-expression in work.

4. The longer an individual has been in an occupation, the more self-expression-oriented he is likely to be toward his work, and the more committed to his occupation.

5. The more self-expression-oriented an individual is, the more likely he is to choose an occupation on the basis of counseling, identification with members of the occupation, or both (i.e., to use counselors as influence and approval groups, and members of the occupation as an identification group).[d]

IV. Other Related Research.

Lipset and Bendix, Kahl, and Rogoff, among others, have studied the amounts of career and intergenerational mobility in the United States and elsewhere.[1] Their pioneering has been valuable but they have used extremely crude indices of occupational level--often the census occupation scale--and they have done little to explain individual differences in mobility.

---

[d] A test of this hypothesis is not given in this manuscript, but one is reported elsewhere. See Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson. "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (December 1960), pp. 116-125, note especially the discussion of the "scientific and esthetic" respondents, substitute "teachers" for "counselors," and the hypothesis will be seen as substantially correct.

[1] Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959; Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure, New York: Rinehart, 1957, pp. 251-275; Natalie Rogoff, Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1953.

Studies of factors in individual occupational choice and mobility have been done mainly by psychologists, focussing on personality and aptitudes as the chief variables.[2] These studies have been largely confined to the higher occupational levels--choices by college students, for example--and have done little exploration of occupational placement at the lower levels where little real "choice" may be exercised. Research now under way at Harvard University deals with socio-cultural factors operating at both high and low occupational levels, but appears to focus mainly on the effect of the family in motivating youths toward educational achievement.[3]

Theoretical orientation for the proposed research has been derived in part from the work of Rosen, Rosenberg, and Parsons, discussed above, on value orientations;[4] and from theoretical studies of reference group behavior and empirical studies of group pressures affecting decision-making.[5]

---

[2] For summaries of studies of vocational choice, see Anne Roe, The Psychology of Occupations, New York: Wiley, 1956, pp. 251-273; and Theodore M. Caplow, The Sociology of Work, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954, pp. 214-229.

[3] Joseph A. Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys, "Harvard Educational Review, 23 (Summer 1953), pp. 186-203; Samuel A. Stouffer, "The Study of Social Mobility: Some Strategic Considerations," paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, Washington, 1957.

[4] Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21 (April 1956), pp. 203-211; Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957; Talcott Parsons, The Social System, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

[5] The best-known treatment of reference group theory is that by Merton and Rossi in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure,

Several distinctive contributions are anticipated. Occupational mobility will be measured by an original technique which gives greater precision than previous methods (described below). The research will assess the role of social (as opposed to psychological) factors affecting career decisions. The range of social factors studied will be broader and more rigorously conceptualized than those reported thus far from the Harvard research. The research will encompass adolescent aspirations, intergenerational mobility, and career mobility, whereas previous studies have dealt with only one of these at a time and have not brought the same theory to the study of all of them.

V. Procedure.

a1. Controls. Not applicable.

a2. Sampling. Two North Carolina communities will be studied. Within each, block samples will be drawn and about 400 white male workers will be interviewed. Negro households will be by-passed. In addition, questionnaires will be administered to white male high school students in the communities.[e]

Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957, pp. 225-386. Studies of group pressures affecting decisions include Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice, New York: Columbia University Press, 1944; Bernard C. Rosen, "Conflicting Group Membership," American Sociological Review, 20 (April 1955), pp. 155-161; and Howard S. Gall, "The Functions of Multi-Group Sanctions in the Academic Decisions of Adolescents" unpublished M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1956.

[e] Deviations from this plan are explained in Chapter 1. We were able to get only about half the intended number of interviews, and different communities were used for the interviews and the high school questionnaires.

b. Data. Data will be obtained through interviews and questionnaires as indicated above. Reference group orientations and value orientations will be related to the work histories (career mobility) of the older adults, the occupational choice processes (intergenerational mobility) of the younger adults, and the aspirations (anticipated intergenerational and career mobility) of the high school pupils.[f] Indicators of key variables are discussed below.

Occupational mobility. Any measure of this is necessarily based on comparison of the respondent's occupation at two or more times (career mobility) or on comparison of the respondent's and his father's occupations (intergenerational mobility). Therefore detailed questions will be asked about respondents' and their fathers' occupational histories. The level of any occupation will be measured by having the research team members rate it on three factors: responsibility, training and skill required, and personal autonomy. These ratings will be converted to a weighted index to measure the prestige level of each occupation. Research by R. L. and I. H. Simpson has established the reliability of such ratings, has found a multiple correlation of .962 between the ratings and public attributions of occupational prestige as shown in the NORC poll analyzed by North and Hatt, and has devised a weighted index through multiple regression analysis. It is felt that this index provides a more refined measure of occupational level than has heretofore been in use.[g]

---

[f] It proved possible to study both career and intergenerational mobility of both younger and older adults rather than merely career mobility of older workers and intergenerational mobility of younger adults. The initial plan was based partly on the fear that occupational choice processes could be accurately studied only among younger workers. Chapter 3 presents evidence that older workers can give what seem to be accurate data about their initial choices of occupations.

Commitment to occupation. Questions will be adapted from those used in studies of adjustment to retirement now being conducted by I. H. Simpson and others at Duke University. Illustrative questions are:

> (Agree or disagree) I would recommend that a son of mine go into the same kind of work I am in.
>
> (Agree or disagree) I would change to some other occupation if I could earn $200 a year more by changing.

Whether these and a number of similar items will form a Guttman scale has not yet been established, but such is the hope.[h]

---

[g] The research referred to is reported in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Correlates and Estimation of Occupational Prestige," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (September 1960), pp. 135-141. Despite the high correlation between these ratings and NORC prestige ratings of 90 occupations, we decided to use the Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status instead; this is a seven-level scheme reported in August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, New York: Wiley, 1958, as one part of the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Class. The Hollingshead index is enormously less time-consuming than the proposed Simpson index, and shares with it the virtue of providing a non-overlapping ordering of occupations by prestige. The reason for originally planning to use the Simpson index was that it can be used in statistical tests which call for interval rather than merely ordinal data, since it involves z-scores. Mobility from one occupation to another could be assigned a z-score value and this value used in correlation analysis, for example. However, this potential advantage would not have been of use in the present study, since our measures of other variables were ordinal only, and the most practical analysis technique turned out to be contingency tables. For this kind of analysis, we had to dichotomize or trichotmoize the mobility data, and this could be done just as well with the simpler Hollingshead index as with the Simpson index. The statement still holds that our measurement of mobility is more accurate than is usually found in studies of mobility, since the Hollingshead index is superior to the Census occupational scale, as is explained in Chapter 2.

[h] Results involving these items are not reported in detail in the body of this report. The main relationship was between high occupational status and high occupational commitment, and this hardly seemed worth

Reference group orientation. Reference group questions have mainly been adapted from the study by Howard S. Gall, cited above in footnote 5. Sample questions for illustrative purposes follow. Good results were obtained from them in the Gall study.

Influence group orientation:

> "With which of the following have you talked [about work plans]?"
>
> "Please indicate how influential you think the following were [in your decision to become a ______]. Mark a '1' by those that influenced you a lot, a '2' by those that influenced you somewhat, and a '3' by those that had little or no effect on your decision."

Identification group orientation:

> Items to measure this are being constructed for use with the high school sample.

Approval group orientation:

> "How much would it bother you if each of the following disapproved strongly [of your occupation, your career plans]?" [1, a great deal; 2, some but not a great deal; 3, hardly any or not at all.]
>
> "Rank the following in order of how important it is to you that they approve of [your occupation, your career plans]. Mark a '1' by the one whose approval is most important to you, etc."

Value orientations will be measured by items taken or adapted from the Rosen and Rosenberg studies, discussed above, and from several other studies.

---

reporting. Further analysis is under way, conducted by Ida H. Simpson, David R. Norsworthy, and Richard L. Simpson, to track down possible relationships not anticipated in the original study design--an attempt to capitalize on serendipity and test hypotheses derived from other kinds of research. Some of the items scaled rather well.

c. Statistics. Correlation coefficients will show association between interval-scale variables; e.g., amount of upward mobility and degree of instrumentalism in value orientation. Where only ordinal or classificatory measurement is possible--e.g., in hypotheses involving the Rosenberg value typology--the measure of association will be chi-square.[i]

d. Time schedule.

Completion and pre-testing of instruments: spring 1959.
Interviews: summer 1959.
Questionnaires in high schools: fall 1959.[j]
Analysis: academic year 1959-60.
Write-up: summer 1960.

---

[i] As noted in footnote g above, interval data were not obtained for most of the main variables, and contingency tables bore most of the burden of analysis. The principal investigator decided against the use of chi-square tests of significance of differences in these contingency tables. Had we applied such tests, some of the results would have been statistically significant at fairly stringent significance levels, others could have been made to appear so if we had dichotomized all variables and used a one-tail test (which would have been possible with one degree of freedom and hypotheses stated in advance), and in other cases the findings would have been statistically insignificant and the argument would have had to rest, as it rests in the absence of significance tests, on the direction and consistency of relationships. Significance tests would be inapplicable to the high school data: the high school respondents can be regarded loosely as a universe rather than a sample, or else they must be regarded as a nonrandom sample of all students in the two schools, since the 11 per cent who were absentees and nonrespondents are presumably a nonrandom portion of the entire universe of students in these schools; in neither case are the high school students a random sample of any definable universe. Some might argue that we should have applied significance tests to the interview data, while others might take a contrary view. For contrasting views on the use of significance tests in survey research, see Hanan C. Selvin, "A Critique of Tests of Significance Tests in Survey Research," American Sociological Review, 22 (October 1957), pp. 519-527; and James M. Beshers, "On 'A Critique of Tests of Significance in Survey Research,'" American Sociological Review, 23 (April 1958), p. 199.

[j] These questionnaires were not administered until May, 1960.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND MARGINAL RESPONSES[1]

1. Are you:

1 358 married 2 0 widowed 3 19 single

4 2 divorced 1 no answer

IF 2 SKIP TO QUESTION 5; IF 3 OR 4 SKIP QUESTION 7.

2. How long have you been married?

1 48 0-4 yrs. 2 84 5-9 yrs. 3 77 10-14 yrs.

4 82 15-24 yrs. 5 70 25 yrs. or more 19 no answer.

3. Are you now living with your wife?

1 349 yes 2 5 no. 26 no answer.

4. Is your wife working?

1 145 yes. 2 215 no. 20 no answer.

5. Do you have any children?

1 298 yes. 2 58 no. 24 no answer

6. How many of your children are now living with you?

0 112 1 103 2 87 3 56

4 14 5 7 6 or more 1

---

[1] Format and instructions to interviewers have been slightly modified in some instances to make for easier readability. Credit for items taken from publications is given at the end of this appendix.

6a. What is your age?

64 29 or younger   86 30-34   114 35-44   70 45-54

36 55-64   6 65 or older   4 no answer

7. How many grades did you finish in school?

1 29 0-6   2 71 7-9   3 37 10-12 but did not graduate from h.s.

4 81 10-12, h.s. grad.   5 51 some college but did not graduate

6 61 college graduate   7 43 college plus graduate or professional

8 7 other, unclassifiable, no answer

8. Were your mother and father living while you were in your teens?

1 319 both living   2 20 father living

3 34 mother living   4 7 neither living

9. What was your father's (mother's, guardian's) occupation at that time?

(Note: Interviewers were instructed to take down enough detail to permit classification; precoded categories were not provided. Classifications by the Census and Hollingshead occupational scales are given in various tables in Chapter 2.)

10. How many grades did your parents finish in school?

	Father	Mother	
1	139	129	0-6
2	93	78	7-9
3	19	19	10-12, did not graduate from high school
4	40	69	10-12, high school graduate
5	25	24	some, college, did not graduate
6	19	25	college graduate
7	8	0	college plus graduate or professional
8	37	36	other, unclassifiable, no answer

11. Where was your home, the main place where you lived when you were a child?

97 Burlington, Graham, or Raleigh   46 Wake or Alamance County

52 County contiguous to Wake or Alamance   90 Other N. C.

36 Va., Tenn., S. C.   55 Other   6 No answer

12. Was this where you were living when you were in your teens (in high school)?

1 343 yes   2 32 no   5 No answer

13. When you were in your teens (high school) did you live:

1 190 in town   2 53 in suburbs or fringe outside of town

3 17 in the country but not on a farm

4 114 on a farm   6 No answer

IF 3 SKIP TO 21, IF 4 SKIP TO 17. (Note: Numbering on the schedule omitted 14 and 15 by mistake.)

16. About what was the population of ______ when you lived there (in your teens)? SKIP TO 21.

(Note: These answers were not trustworthy; size of community was established by consulting Census figures.)

17. Did your family own the farm where you lived?

1 85 yes   2 35 no   3 260 no answer or inapplicable

IF YES SKIP TO 19.

18. Did they:

1 11 rent for cash   2 21 work on shares

3 348 other, unclassifiable, no answer, inapplicable

19. What size farm was it? Do you know the number of acres it had?

1 15 less than 50   2 5 50   3 23 51-99   4 10 100

5 16 101-149   6 5 150   7 23 151-249   8 16 250-999

9 2 1,000 or more   265 no answer, inapplicable

20. IF RESPONDENT DOESN'T KNOW HOW MANY ACRES: Would you say it was small, medium, or large in comparison with most farms?

1 7 small   2 16 medium   3 5 large   352 no answer, inapplicable

IF GREW UP ON FARM SKIP TO 22.

21. Did your family own the home where you lived?

1 184 yes   2 105 no   91 no answer, inapplicable

22. How many rooms did your family's home have?

1 2   2 2   3 7   4 38   5 74

6 83   7 73   8 47   9 or more 46   8 no answer

(Note: It seems apparent that some of the answers to question 22 were a little fanciful. We made no use of this question in analysis.)

23. Would you say that your home then was small, medium, or large in comparison with most homes?

x 36 small   y 217 medium   0 123 large   4 no answer

24. Are your father and mother now living?

1 149 both living   2 114 mother   3 33 father

4 82 neither   2 no answer

IF 2 OR 3 SKIP TO 26; IF 4 SKIP TO 29.

25. Are they living together or are they separated?

1 133 together   2 16 separated   231 no answer, inapplicable

26, 27. Where do they (does he, she) live? How far is this from where you live? INTERVIEWER: WRITE THIS OUT.

17 same house as respondent   39 same neighborhood

45 same city   27 same county   92 same state (N.C.)

59 other   101 no answer, inapplicable

(Note: Answers to the second part of this question, #27, "How far is this from where you live," were inaccurate and are omitted for that reason.)

28. About how often do you visit back and forth with them? Include visits back and forth in either direction. USE BOTH COLUMNS IF PARENTS ARE SEPARATED, FIRST COLUMN ONLY IF THEY LIVE TOGETHER.

	Mother or Both	Father	
1	21	6	daily or more
2	37	12	weekly or more, but not every day
3	26	12	monthly or more, but not every week
4	37	13	yearly or more, but not every month
5	2	0	less often than once a year
6	1	0	never
	256	337	no answer, inapplicable

29. When you have a choice (if you had a choice, etc.) do you prefer most to visit with:

1 117 your parents (mother or father)

2 23 your wife's parents

3 41 other relatives

4 19 neighbors

5 95 friends who are not neighbors or relatives

6 67 no preference

18

30. Which of these do you actually visit with the most?

1 81 your parents (mother or father)

2 55 your wife's parents

3 47 other relatives

4 34 neighbors

5 120 friends who aren't relatives or neighbors

6 16 don't know, can't say, impossible to say, etc.

27 no answer

31. Would you say you do more or less visiting than most people?

1 51 more   2 133 same   3 193 less   3 no answer

32. How do you feel about (Burlington, Graham, Raleigh) as a place to live?

1 243 like it a lot   2 115 like it fairly well

4 14 don't like it too well   4 7 dislike a lot

1 no answer

33. When you read the newspaper, are you usually more interested in news about things happening here in (Burlington, Graham, Raleigh) or in news about what happens in other places?

1 181 local   2 179 other places   20 no answer

(Note: For question 34, one sheet was provided for the first job and the interviewer used as many sheets as needed for subsequent jobs. Most of the information derived from this question is used for the analysis in Chapters 2 and 3. Therefore marginals are not included here since the analysis was largely in terms of patterns rather than straight counting of individual answers.)

34. Now could you tell me about all of the full-time regular jobs that you have ever had, starting with the first one. I don't mean part-time or summer jobs while you were still in school; just regular full-time jobs.

How about the first regular job you had--what was it? INTERVIEWER GET ENOUGH INFORMATION, AS ON FATHER'S JOB EARLIER, SO WE CAN RATE THIS JOB.

(1) Where was this job (city or town)?

(2) How long did you have this job (dates if possible)?

(3) How old were you when you started this job?

(4) Why did you go into this work instead of some other kind of work?

INTERVIEWER: IF HE MENTIONS MORE THAN ONE REASON, WRITE '1' BY FIRST REASON, '2' BY SECOND REASON, ETC.

1, negative extrinsic (only one available, not qualified for anything else, etc.); 2, high income; 3, secure income; 4, community prestige; 5, freedom from supervision; 6, advancement, career; 7, work group, people in that occupation are pleasant, etc.; 8, traditional family occupation; 9, other positive extrinsic (hours, near home, working conditions, etc.); 10, enjoy the work, self-expression, creativity, etc.; 11, serve humanity, contribute to society, etc.; 12, other (specify). [Interviewers were instructed to avoid the "other" category if answer could be coded elsewhere; coders classified "other" responses elsewhere when possible.]

(5) Why did you leave this job (or this type of work)? OMIT IF HE STILL HAS THIS JOB. RANK 1, 2, 3, ETC.

1, didn't like this job; 2, chance for a better job, to take a different job, to go into something I liked better, etc.; 3, was fired, laid off, etc.; 4, other (specify).

NEXT SHEET (one of these was filled out for each subsequent job):

(1) What was the next regular full-time job you had?

(2) Where was this job (city or town)?

(3) How long did you have this job (dates if possible)?

(4) Why did you take this job instead of some other job? RANK 1, 2, 3, etc.

1, negative extrinsic; 2, high income; 3, secure income; 4, community prestige; 5, freedom from supervision; 6, advancement, career; 7, work group, people in that occupation are pleasant, etc.; 8, traditional family occupation; 9, other positive extrinsic; 10, enjoy the work, self-expression, creativity, etc.; 11, serve humanity, contribute to society, etc.; 12, other (specify).

(5) Why did you leave this job (or this type of work)? OMIT IF HE STILL HAS THIS JOB. RANK 1, 2, 3, ETC.

1, didn't like this job; 2, chance for a better job, to take a different job, to go into something I liked better, etc.; 3, was fired, laid off, went broke, etc.; 4, other (specify).

(Note: Questions 35, 36, and 37 included a rather elaborate chart to be filled out by the interviewer. We indicate below the question wording and basic kinds of data obtained, and after giving these, we give information which was coded from the chart.)

35. Before you took your first regular full-time job, what people gave you advice or information about your future work career? INTERVIEWER: AFTER RESPONDENT HAS STOPPED NAMING PEOPLE SPONTANEOUSLY, PROMPT HIM FOR ANY THAT HE MAY HAVE FORGOTTEN. (Did you get any advice from mother, from father, etc., as listed on the chart?)

The following possible advisers were listed: mother, father; other relatives (kin); wife; other men about same age as you; other men not same age as you, older or younger; women about same age as you; women not same age as you, older or younger; teachers or professors; minister, priest, rabbi; any others (who?).

Interviewers placed a check mark on the chart, for each of the above possible sources of advice, in one of three categories: mentions spontaneously, gave advice (mentions after prompting), did not give advice.

36. Would you say that (mother, father, etc.) had a lot of influence on your choice of a work career, not much influence, or no influence? INTERVIEWER: GO BACK THROUGH THE LIST ABOVE, ASKING ABOUT ALL WHO DID ADVISE.

37. What three people had the strongest influence on your plans for a work career before you actually started working in your first regular full-time job? Who had the most influence? The second most? The third most? INTERVIEWER RECORD ANSWER IN CHART BY RANK, 1-2-3.

Answers to Question 35:

Number of persons mentioned spontaneously as having given advice:

0 179 1 105 2 55

3 28 4 10 5 3

Number of persons mentioned as having given advice, either spontaneously or after prompting:

0 78 1 54 2 85 3 80

4 50 5 18 6 9 7 0

8 2 9 4

Answers to Question 36:

Number of persons having much influence:

0 213 1 106 2 45 3 10

4 4 5 2

Number of persons having either much or some influence:

0 108 1 75 2 97 3 65

4 22 5 7 6 4 7 1

8 0 9 1

Answers to Question 37:

Person whose influence was ranked first:

mother 38 father 85 other relatives 39

wife 19 children 4 non-family 86

no single person 109

Parents as Advisers Concerning First Job (from questions 35-37):

	Mother	Father
Mentioned spontaneously.	53	90
Gave advice (not mentioned spontaneously). . .	122	111
Did not give advice.	158	122
No answer to question 35	15	19
Much influence	40	58
Some influence	84	105
No influence	80	64
No answer or did not give advice	143	115
Ranked first in influence.	37	85
Ranked second in influence	57	63
Ranked third in influence.	35	19
Unranked, did not advise, no answer.	250	213

38. Before you took your first regular full-time job (became a ______), had you known anyone who was in this kind of work?

1 273 yes   2 102 no   5 no answer

IF NO, SKIP TO 41.

39. Who did you know who was in this occupation?

1 67 father   2 103 other relatives   3 132 other men about same age as you, not kin to you

4 105 other men older than you, not kin to you

5 111 other, unclassifiable, inapplicable, no answer

40. How much influence did knowing someone in this kind of work have on your decision to go into it yourself?

1 148 much   2 57 some   3 70 little or none

4 105 inapplicable, no answer

41. How old were you when you first thought about going into the kind of work you first went into?

13 10 or younger   16 11-13   169 14-17

105 18-20   68 21 or older   9 no answer

42. How old were you when you made a definite decision to go into this kind of work?

5 10 or younger   4 11-13   133 14-17

125 18-20   104 21 or older   9 no answer

43. About how long was this (the definite decision) before you actually started your first regular full-time job in this work? (Answers are given to nearest year.)

247 0   40 1   19 2   26 3   13 4

11 5   3 6   2 7   6 8   8 9 or more

5 no answer

44. When you were in your teens (high school) did you think very often about the kind of work you would go into?

1 103 much 2 104 some 3 170 little or none

3 no answer

45. Back then before you started working, how much trouble did you have in making up your mind about the kind of work you wanted to do?

1 34 very much 2 48 some, not too much 3 81 very little

4 214 no trouble at all 3 no answer

46. When you first went into full-time regular work (became a ______), did your mother approve or disapprove of the kind of work you went into? How about your father, did he approve or disapprove? How about other relatives, etc.?

(Note: This question, like questions 35-37, was set up in chart form for the interviewer to check responses. Interviewers asked about attitudes of the following: mother; father; other relatives; wife; other men about same age, not kin; other men or boys not same age, older or younger, not kin; women about same age, not kin; women or girls not same age, older or younger, not kin; teachers or professors; minister, priest, rabbi; others (specify). Possible responses checked for each category of people by interviewers were approved; disapproved; had no opinion, didn't care, etc.; don't know, unclassifiable.

Responses Coded from Question 46:

Number of persons or categories approving of first job:

0 36 1 35 2 69 3 68

4 53 5 41 6 25 7 22

5 15 9 or more 16

Parents' attitudes regarding first job:

	Mother	Father
Approved.	288	262
Disapproved	27	23
Had no opinion.	20	19
Don't know, unclassifiable.	45	76

47. When you first went into regular full-time work, how much would it have bothered you if your mother had disapproved strongly of the kind of work you went into? How much would it have bothered you if your father had disapproved strongly? Etc.

(Note: This question was also set up for the interviewer in chart form. Interviewers asked about attitudes regarding mother; father; other relatives; other men or boys, not kin; other women or girls, not kin; wife (if married); teachers, professors; others (specify). Possible responses checked by interviewers for each category of people were (it would bother) a great deal; some, a little; none.)

Responses Coded from Question 47:

Number of people or groups whose strong disapproval would have bothered respondent a great deal:

None or no answer 219 1 69 2 68 3 16
4 7 5 0 6 1

Number of people or groups whose strong disapproval would not have bothered respondent at all:

1 12 2 21 3 29 4 65 5 103 6 55
7 21 8 43 no answer 31

How much it would have bothered respondent if parents had disapproved strongly of first job:

	Mother	Father
A great deal.	101	103
Some.	158	135
None.	83	77
No answer	38	65

48. In general, what kind of advice did your mother give you about what kind of work to go into? How about your father, what kind of advice did he give you?

	Mother	Father	
1	75	69	Get more education or training.
2	37	49	Aim high, make good, succeed, amount to something.
3	69	71	Do whatever I liked.
4	1	0	Take life easy, don't worry about job success.
5	135	88	Gave no advice.
6	73	103	Other, unclassifiable, deceased, no answer.

49. Would your mother have been disappointed if the kind of work you first went into had been a lot worse than what you actually did go into? How about your father--would he have been disappointed? IF YES: How disappointed would your mother have been? How disappointed would your father have been?

	Mother	Father	
1	147	133	very disappointed
2	112	102	somewhat disappointed
3	74	76	not disappointed, wouldn't have cared, etc.
4	47	69	deceased, no answer

IF RESPONDENT HAS HAD ONLY ONE JOB, SKIP TO 54.

(Note: For questions 50, 51, and 52, a chart was used by the interviewer as in questions 35, 36, and 37. We indicate below the question wordings and basic kinds of data obtained, and after giving these, we give information which was coded from the chart.)

50. During your work career, when you have had to make a decision about finding or taking a new job (position), what people have you talked with before making up your mind? INTERVIEWER: AFTER RESPONDENT STOPS NAMING PEOPLE, PROMPT HIM.

The following possible advisers were listed: mother; father; other relatives (kin); wife; children; other men about the same age as you, not kin; other men not same age, older or younger, not kin; women about same age as you, not kin; women not same age, older or younger, not kin; minister, priest, rabbi; any others (who?).

Interviewers placed a check mark on the chart, for each of the above possible sources of advice, in one of three categories: mentions spontaneously, gave advice (mentions after prompting), did not give advice.

51. FOR EACH PERSON RESPONDENT HAS TALKED WITH: Would you say that ____ has had a lot of influence on your decisions about new jobs, not much influence, or no influence at all?

52. During your work career when you have had to make these decisions about new jobs, what three people have generally had the strongest influence on your decisions? INTERVIEWER: GET THEM IN ORDER, 1-2-3.

(Note: Following questions 54, 55, and 56, which used a chart of the same kind as questions 35-37 and 50-52, responses from questions 50-52 and 54-56 will be given.)

53. How much trouble have you usually had in making these decisions about changing jobs during your work career?

1 28 very much trouble   2 80 not too much trouble

3 89 very little trouble   4 124 no trouble at all

59 no answer, only one job (never changed)

54. If you were offered a new and different job right now, what people would you talk with before you decided whether to take the new job? AFTER RESPONDENT STOPS NAMING PEOPLE, PROMPT HIM.

55. FOR EACH PERSON RESPONDENT WOULD TALK WITH: Would you expect ____ to have a lot of influence, not much influence, or no influence at all on your decision about accepting a new job?

56. If you had to decide now whether to accept a new and different job that was offered to you, what three people would you expect to have the most influence on the decision you would make? GET THEM IN ORDER, 1-2-3.

Answers to Questions 50-52 and 54-56:

Number of persons mentioned spontaneously as advisers during work career or now:

	During Career	Now
None, or no answer to question.	145	60
1.	119	143
2.	64	103
3.	33	49
4.	13	21
5.	4	4
6.	1	0
7.	1	0

Number of persons mentioned as advisers during work career or now, whether mentioned spontaneously or after prompting:

	During Career	Now
None, or no answer to question.	97	22
1.	51	60
2.	66	100
3.	79	85
4.	47	69
5.	21	21
6.	13	13
7.	3	4
8.	1	2
9.	2	4

Number of persons having much influence on career decisions, during work career or now:

	During Career	Now
None, or no answer to question.	199	140
1.	99	137
2.	53	76
3.	22	22
4.	5	3
5.	1	1
6.	0	1
7.	1	0

Person whose influence was ranked first, on career decisions during work career or now:

	During Career	Now
Mother.	10	2
Father.	19	5
Other relatives	18	7
Wife.	152	236
Non-family.	68	92
No single person, no answer.	113	38

Parents as advisers during work career:

	Mother	Father
Mentioned spontaneously. . . .	40	48
Gave advice (not mentioned spontaneously)	45	52
Did not give advice.	179	152
No answer.	13	15
Much influence	18	26
Some influence	47	58
No influence	56	39
No answer.	157	144
Ranked first in influence. . .	10	20
Ranked second in influence . .	20	31
Ranked third in influence. . .	25	25
No answer to question 52 or to entire set (50-52)	323	303

57. Various people may have said something to show that they approve or disapprove of the line of work you are in now. Does your mother (if living) approve of the work you are in now, or disapprove, or have no opinion one way or the other? How about your father? Your wife? Your children?

	Mother	Father	Wife	Children	
1	241	177	320	154	approve
2	6	4	23	3	disapprove
3	15	7	7	56	no opinion
4	118	192	30	167	no answer, don't know, deceased, not married, no children

58. Now I am going to list the same people again. For each one, please tell me how much it would bother you if they disapproved strongly of the kind of work you were in.

	Mother	Father	Wife	Children	
1	49	33	185	46	would bother me very much
2	105	76	103	49	would bother me somewhat
3	120	91	62	122	little, not at all
4	106	180	30	163	no answer, don't know, deceased, not married, no children

59. If you had it all to do over again, would you still be a ______?

1 265 yes   2 110 no   5 no answer

IF NO: What kind of work would you go into?

Hollingshead IOS level: 46 1   3 2   15 3

1 4   9 5   12 6   6 7   288 no answer, inapplicable

IF YES TO 59, SKIP TO 61.

60. Why would you choose this kind of work instead of the work you are actually doing?

49 prefer the work   42 advancement

9 dislike present job   280 no answer, inapplicable

61. Where you went to school, did they have a program set up to give vocational guidance to the students, to help them decide what kind of work to go into?

1 81 yes   2 288 no   11 no answer

IF NO TO 61, SKIP TO 64

62. Did you receive any vocational counseling in this program?

1 45 yes   2 36 no   299 no answer, inapplicable

IF NO TO 62, SKIP TO 64

63. Do you think the counseling they gave you had any influence on your choice of an occupation?

1____Yes, it helped me decide, it was helpful, etc.

2____Yes, it confused me, led me astray, was bad advice, etc.

3 ____ No, it had no influence.

____ No answer, inapplicable.

64. In thinking about your life 10 years from now, what do you hope for most in connection with your work? INTERVIEWER: DON'T SUGGEST RESPONSES; ASK OPEN-ENDED AND CODE IN ORDER OF MENTION, 1-2-3 etc.

Item mentioned first:

1 89 security, still have job, etc.

2 19 autonomy, freedom, etc.

3 123 occupational advancement, more important job, promotion, etc.

4 46 more money

5 47 will be retired, hope to retire

6 52 other, unclassifiable

4 no answer

IF 5 (RETIRED) SKIP TO 68.

65. Specifically, what kind of work do you hope to be doing 10 years from now?

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status:

139 1   122 2   10 3   26 4

22 5   10 6   8 7   43 no answer

66. What kind of work do you actually expect to be doing 10 years from now?

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status:

182 1   8 2   28 3   5 4

94 5   14 6   6 7   43 no answer

67. How do you expect that the money you are making 10 years from now will compare with the money you are making now?

1 121 It will be much more.

2 157 It will be somewhat more.

3 50 It will be about the same.

4 15 It will be somewhat less.

5 1 It will be much less.

36 No answer.

68. Suppose you were offered a much better job than you now have, or a chance to make a substantial advance in your occupation. Would you go after the better job if it meant:

	Yes	No	No Answer, Don't Know	
1	30	344	6	endangering your health?
2	107	253	20	moving around the country a lot?
3	263	99	18	moving to a different community?
4	291	83	6	leaving your friends?
5	181	185	14	giving up a lot of leisure time, working longer hours?
6	238	131	11	learning a new type of work?
7	229	143	8	working harder on the job than you do now?
8	317	58	5	taking on more responsibility, more decisions to make?
9	74	296	10	keeping away from your family for some time?
10	233	128	19	keeping quiet about your attitudes toward unions?

69. One person may like a job where he is a part of an organization, working with other people as a team. Another might prefer a job where he does his own work and gets individual credit for it himself. Which kind of job do you think is better—one where you work as part of a team or one where you work as an individual

1 244 organization 2 125 individual 11 no answer

70. If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in?

1 20 upper class 2 148 working class 3 205 middle class

4 4 lower class 3 no answer

71. Which social class would you like to belong to?

1 63 upper class 2 114 working class 3 195 middle class

4 2 lower class 6 no answer

72. If you have children, which social class do you think they will be in when they have families of their own?

1 51 upper class 2 81 working class 3 205 middle class

4 1 lower class 42 no answer, no children

73. Which social class did your parents belong in when you were in your teens (high school)?

1 19 upper class 2 186 working class 3 160 middle class

4 11 lower class 4 no answer

74. Think of the people that you and your family most often visit back and forth with in your homes, not including relatives. Would you say that they are mainly in a higher social class than you, or are they mainly in a lower social class than you?

1 22 higher 2 2 lower 3 302 same

4 49 some of each 5 no answer

75. Suppose a person belongs to one class and wants to belong in a different class. If he has ability and works hard, what do you think his chances are for moving from one class to another?

1 120 very good 2 170 good 3 64 fair

4 23 poor, not good 3 no answer

76. When you were in your teens (high school), how much time did you usually spend hanging around or doing things with other boys your age?

1 65 more time than the average 2 214 about an average amount

3 96 less time than the average 5 no answer

77. When you were in your teens, were you usually a member of a crowd or gang of boys who always did things together?

1 282 yes   2 92 no   6 no answer

78. I am going to name several things that might determine how satisfied people are with the jobs or occupations they have. Different people disagree on how important they think these things are. For each feature, would you tell me how important it is in determining how satisfied you personally are with a job.

	Very impt.	Fairly impt.	Not impt.	No Ans.	
1	135	201	38	6	Prestige of the job, its standing compared with other situations
2	218	132	26	4	The kind of tasks or duties the job requires you to perform
3	231	140	5	4	The amount of money the job pay
4	207	156	11	6	Whether the job leaves you with enough time to spend with your family or friends
5	242	118	14	6	Whether the job gives you a chance to use your special abilities
6	144	170	56	10	Whether the job gives you a chance to work with people rather than things
7	108	220	44	8	Whether it is the kind of job that would make your parents proud of you
8	141	186	45	8	Whether the work makes a contribution to society
9	149	181	41	9	Whether the work allows you to be creative and original
10	288	75	11	6	Whether the job is stable and secure
11	145	180	48	7	Whether the job leaves you fairly free of supervision, lets you be independent
12	302	70	3	5	How well you get along with the people you work with

79. Now I am going to list the same features of a job or occupation again. Tell me how the job you now have compares with most jobs on each of these things--whether your job is better, worse, or about the same as most jobs.

	Better	**Same**	**Worse**	**No Ans.**	
1	176	172	16	16	Prestige of the job, its standing compared with other jobs
2	166	176	21	17	The kinds of tasks or duties the job requires you to perform
3	169	162	35	14	The amount of money the job pays
4	113	180	69	18	Whether the job leaves you enough time to spend with your family and friends
5	197	143	26	14	Whether the job gives you a chance to use your special abilities
6	181	166	17	16	Whether the job gives you a chance to work with people rather than with things
7	148	209	7	16	Whether it is the kind of job that would make your parents proud of you
8	147	193	20	20	Whether the work makes a contribution to society
9	127	188	43	22	Whether the work allows you to be creative and original
10	201	138	23	18	Whether the job is stable and secure
11	204	136	25	15	Whether the job leaves you fairly free of supervision, lets you be independent
12	186	172	6	16	How well you get along with the people you work with

80. What one thing do you think is most important in determining how satisfied you personally would be with any job you might have? INTERVIEWER: LIST THE PRECEDING ITEMS IF NECESSARY, BUT LET RESPONDENT ANSWER WITHOUT

REMINDING HIM IF POSSIBLE. VARY THE ORDER SO AS NOT TO STACK THE DECK IN FAVOR OF THE FIRST ITEMS. WRITE OUT THE ANSWER.

1 5 prestige

2 14 tasks

3 65 money

4 2 time for family and friends

5 28 use special abilities

6 1 work with people, not things

7 1 make parents proud

8 17 contribution to society

9 3 creative and original

10 47 stable and secure

11 16 independence and freedom

12 64 get along with co-workers

9 chance for advancement

108 no answer or not classifiable by above scheme

81. If you had to name two things about a person--qualities that help him to get ahead--what would these qualities be? WRITE OUT ANSWER.

Item mentioned first:

261 vaguely indicated personal qualities (e.g., ability); residual to categories below

69 hard work, ambition

25 education, training

8 connections, know the right people, etc.

0 luck, breaks

17 no answer

82. What would you say are the two most important things a person should do in order to have a happy life?

Item mentioned first:

113 responses related to work

245 responses not related to work

22 no answer

83. Suppose someone offered to pay your tuition to attend a night training course pertaining to your work. Which one of the following would you be most likely to do? INTERVIEWER: READ THEM SO HE CAN MAKE FIRST CHOICE. Which would you be least likely to do?

	Most Likely	Least Likely	
1	4	271	Decide not to attend because it would interfere with your social life
2	49	37	Decide not to attend because it would keep you away from your family at night
3	59	27	Decide to attend because you would enjoy it
4	241	19	Decide to attend because it might lead to advancement in your career
	27	26	No answer

84. Suppose you had all your bills paid and got a bonus at the end of the year by surprise. Which one of the following would you be most likely to do. Which would you be least likely to do?

	Most Likely	Least Likely	
1	17	268	Use it to by new clothes, sports equipment, to have a good time for yourself, or something like that
2	50	80	Use it in some way to get ahead in your work--take a training course, go to night school, etc.
3	296	6	Use it to do something with your family, or buy things for the people in your family
	17	26	No answer

85. Which one of the following things is most important to you personally? Which one of them is least important?

	Most impt.	Least impt.	
1	52	27	Getting ahead in your work, having a good job
2	304	4	Having a happy family life
3	2	325	Enjoying life in other ways--buying things, recreation
	22	24	No answer

86. Here is an imaginary situation. Suppose a man is attending a college or trade school, studying to qualify himself for a better job. His father gets into financial trouble and needs money right away to keep up the payments on his house. The father will lose his house if he misses a payment. Do you think the man should lend his father money, even if it means dropping out of school and missing a chance at a better job--or should he stay in school and let his father lose the house? (Note: In addition to the responses given, interviewers were instructed to indicate their judgment of how much trouble the respondents had in deciding how to answer this question.)

1 230 lend father money (little or no hesitation in answering)

2 65 lend father money (much hesitation)

3 25 can't decide

4 37 stay in school (much hesitation)

5 21 stay in school (little or no hesitation)

2 no answer

Here are some statements that some people agree with, but that others disagree with. Please tell me, when I read each statement, whether you personally agree or disagree with the statement--and how strongly you agree or disagree.

Note: Responses are designated below as follows:

SA: strongly agree
A: agree but not strongly
U: undecided (Interviewers were instructed to try to persuade respondents to take a stand, and to be sparing in the use of the undecided category.)
D: disagree but not strongly
SD: strongly disagree
NA: no answer because of failure in interviewing

87. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.

12 SA 60 A 9 U 183 D 112 SD 4 NA

88. A man should feel very disturbed if his sons end up doing factory work.

9 SA   50 A   10 U   223 D   81 SD   7 NA

89. The way to feel secure is to settle down in a job you like and not always keep trying to get ahead.

23 SA   91 A   11 U   164 D   86 SD   5 NA

90. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world, with the way things look for the future.

7 SA   21 A   6 U   147 D   195 SD   4 NA

91. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

10 SA   50 A   5 U   181 D   128 SD   6 NA

92. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.

35 SA   102 A   8 U   157 D   74 SD   4 NA

93. There's little use writing to public officials, because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

27 SA   83 A   22 U   184 D   60 SD   4 NA

94. A woman's place is in the home, and no married woman should work if her family could do without the money she could earn.

95 SA   148 A   6 U   107 D   20 SD   4 NA

95. Planning only makes a person unhappy, since your plans never work out anyway.

8 SA   38 A   3 U   184 D   143 SD   4 NA

96. When a man is born, the success he is going to have is already in the cards, so he might as well accept it and not fight against it.

5 SA   11 A   8 U   162 D   190 SD   4 NA

97. Even if it means making less money, a person should refuse to take a job that would take him too far away from his parents to see them often.

12 SA 39 A 11 U 234 D 80 SD 4 NA

98. The government should leave things like electric power and housing for private businessmen to handle.

48 SA 113 A 43 U 139 D 31 SD 6 NA

99. If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.

74 SA 196 A 9 U 82 D 12 SD 7 NA

100. Nowadays a person has to make good strictly on his own, and if he does succeed his parents don't deserve credit for his success.

8 SA 38 A 13 U 217 D 99 SD 5 NA

101. All I want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay to afford a nice car and a home of my own.

24 SA 85 A 1 U 182 D 83 SD 5 NA

102. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you come right down to it.

20 SA 67 A 2 U 202 D 84 SD 5 NA

103. The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.

57 SA 115 A 14 U 141 D 48 SD 5 NA

104. No matter what they say, most people are really jealous when you get ahead.

21 SA 160 A 12 U 153 D 29 SD 5 NA

105. It would be unwise to put money into a brand new car, when the money could be used for education or to get started in a business.

134 SA 193 A 4 U 36 D 7 SD 6 NA

106. Whether we like it or not, we may as well accept the fact that public schools all over the South will be integrated some day.

69 SA 254 A 10 U 24 D 17 SD 6 NA

107. This country would be better off if all workers belonged to unions.

26 SA 64 A 21 U 163 D 100 SD 6 NA

108. A person should be willing to sacrifice a lot of comfort and leisure in order to get all the training and education he possibly can.

109 SA 119 A 6 U 35 D 5 SD 6 NA

109. A person who is an atheist should be allowed to teach in the public schools, as long as he sticks to his subject matter and doesn't preach atheism to his students.

43 SA 188 A 11 U 61 D 69 SD 8 NA

110. If cities and towns around the country need help to build more schools, the government in Washington ought to give them the money they need.

36 SA 162 A 21 U 125 D 29 SD 7 NA

111. The government ought to help people to get doctors and hospital care at low cost.

58 SA 155 A 11 U 113 D 36 SD 7 NA

112. It is unwise to put a lot of money into buying insurance, when you could use the money for things you would like to have right now.

14 SA 58 A 7 U 196 D 98 SD 7 NA

113. Big business corporations should not have much to say about how the government is run.

41 SA   147 A   15 U   149 D   18 SD   10 NA

114. The government ought to cut taxes, even if it means putting off some important things that need to be done.

10 SA   41 A   10 U   231 D   81 SD   7 NA

115. In what year was your father born? PROBES IF NOT SURE: How old is he now? If he is deceased, when did he die and how old was he then?

15 before 1860   16 1860-1869   74 1870-1879

102 1880-1889   95 1890-1899   57 1900-1909

9 1910 or later   12 no answer

116. If you had to choose, which would you rather be--independent, successful, or well liked?

1 60 independent   2 104 successful   3 204 well liked

12 no answer

117. How important is it to you, personally, to get ahead in life?

1 176 very important   2 127 fairly important

3 61 not very important   4 9 very unimportant, not important at all

7 no answer

118. Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful in your dealings with people. How do you feel about it?

1 244 people can be trusted   2 147 can't be too careful

9 no answer

119. Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others or more inclined to look out for themselves.

1 131 help others   2 242 look out for themselves   7 no answer

120. How would you say you feel most of the time--in good spirits or in low spirits?

1 153 very good   2 184 pretty good   3 32 so-so

4 3 pretty low   5 1 very low   6 7 no answer

121. Are you the sort of person who lets things worry you, or don't you let things worry you?

1 26 worry very much   2 63 worry pretty much

3 192 worry some   4 94 don't worry

5 no answer

(Note: A chart was provided for the interviewer to record answers to the following questions, concerning brothers and sisters. After giving the question wording, we will present data coded from the responses recorded on the interviewers' charts.)

122. Do you have any brothers?

IF NO BROTHERS, SKIP TO 126.

123. FOR EACH BROTHER: Is he older or younger than you?

124. FOR EACH BROTHER: How many years did he finish in school?

125. FOR EACH BROTHER: How would you say the work he does compares with the work you do in its general standing or prestige in the community?

126. Do you have any sisters?

IF NO SISTERS, SKIP TO 128.

127. How many sisters older than you? Younger than you?

Data from Questions 122-127:

Number of older brothers:

198 0 or no answer 98 1 41 2 32 3

21 4 or more

Number of younger brothers:

197 0 or no answer 85 1 55 2 25 3

18 4 or more

Number of older sisters:

213 0 or no answer 93 1 45 2 24 3

15 4 or more

Number of younger sisters:

213 0 or no answer 97 1 51 2 21 3

8 4 or more

Do you have any brothers:

1 284 yes 2 89 no 7 no answer

Do you have any sisters?

1 284 yes 2 86 no 10 no answer

Brothers' schooling:

96 One or more attended college

181 None attended college

105 No answer, no brothers.

Success of older brothers compared with success of respondent:

Does respondent have one or more older brothers whose occupational standing is higher than his own?

54 yes   135 no   191 no answer, don't know, no older brothers

Does respondent have one or more older brothers whose occupational standing is lower than his own?

64 yes   125 no   191 no answer, don't know, no older brothers

Does respondent have one or more younger brothers whose occupational standing is higher than his own?

40 yes   134 no   206 no answer, don't know, no younger brothers

Does respondent have one or more younger brothers whose occupational standing is lower than his own?

64 yes   113 no   203 no answer, don't know, no younger brothers

Here are some more statements that some people might agree with but others disagree with. When I read each statement, please tell me whether you personally agree or disagree with the statement, and how strongly you agree or disagree. These are about the way you feel regarding your work.

128. Most of my friends think I have a good job.

79 SA   264 A   9 U   20 D   3 SD   5 NA

129. I am well suited to the kind of work I do.

99 SA   251 A   3 U   18 D   3 SD   6 NA

130. Except for my family, the people I like best are the ones I work with.

34 SA   166 A   12 U   157 D   6 SD   5 NA

131. I always like for people to know the kind of work I do.

56 SA   215 A   25 U   72 D   5 SD   7 NA

132. I am usually glad when lunch time is over and I can get back to work.

14 SA 119 A 28 U 158 D 48 SD 13 NA

133. My job would be better if it weren't for the people I have to work with.

3 SA 23 A 9 U 226 D 113 SD 6 NA

134. I would be proud for a son of mine to go into my kind of work.

61 SA 193 A 6 U 87 D 27 SD 6 NA

135. If I inherited a million dollars, I would still want to keep on doing the work I do now.

37 SA 142 A 5 U 97 D 94 SD 5 NA

136. The work I do is dull.

6 SA 27 A 6 U 186 D 149 SD 6 NA

137. When something goes wrong on the job, it helps me to talk about it to the people I work with.

85 SA 239 A 7 U 37 D 7 SD 5 NA

138. I often wish I had been able to go into a better class of work.

38 SA 123 A 6 U 165 D 39 SD 9 NA

139. Even if I had an entirely different job, I would like to do the kind of work I do now sometimes, just for fun.

56 SA 196 A 9 U 82 D 28 SD 9 NA

140. I don't care who I work with, as long as they don't bother me.

31 SA 160 A 5 U 136 D 42 SD 6 NA

141. I like to associate with the class of people who do the kind of work I do.

60 SA 261 A 4 U 46 D 3 SD 6 NA

142. Toward the end of the day, it often seems as if quitting time will never come.

27 SA 96 A 9 U 176 D 66 SD 6 NA

143. One of the best things about my work is the people I work with.

57 SA 255 A 6 U 61 D 4 SD 7 NA

144. My family is proud of the kind of work I do.

61 SA 266 A 13 U 27 D 8 SD 5 NA

145. I wouldn't like to have my work week cut to 20 hours, even if my income stayed the same.

30 SA 101 A 8 U 126 D 107 SD 8 NA

146. The work I do is important.

136 SA 221 A 3 U 12 D 2 SD 6 NA

147. When I'm at home, I often think about my friends at work.

14 SA 206 A 10 U 119 D 24 SD 7 NA

148. When I look over my work career so far, I think I have been successful.

47 SA 270 A 8 U 44 D 11 SD 0 NA

149. Nobody would do the kind of work I do, if he didn't have to.

11 SA 28 A 5 U 184 D 139 SD 13 NA

150. I would miss the people I work with if they left.

57 SA 271 A 7 U 38 D 1 SD 6 NA

151. People in my kind of work are well thought of in the community.

65 SA 277 A 15 U 15 D 2 SD 6 NA

152. I am usually glad when the week end is over and I can get back to work.

14 SA 133 A 24 U 159 D 40 SD 10 NA

153. People know it takes real ability to do the kind of work I do.

39 SA 242 A 12 U 75 D 4 SD 8 NA

154. I am proud of my ability as a worker.

87 SA 273 A 4 U 9 D 0 SD 7 NA

155. I would rather do the work I do than most other kinds of work that pay the same money.

122 SA 212 A 5 U 28 D 5 SD 8 NA

156. A lot of people would like to trade their work for mine.

45 SA 218 A 40 U 58 D 10 SD 9 NA

157. Sometimes I am ashamed of the kind of work I do.

4 SA 16 A 2 U 139 D 212 SD 7 NA

Now the next two statements don't refer to your work necessarily.

158. I usually don't have enough confidence in myself.

6 SA 55 A 1 U 206 D 107 SD 5 NA

159. I get upset if someone criticizes me, no matter who it is.

3 SA 63 A 7 U 203 D 97 SD 7 NA

That's all the statements I'll ask you to agree or disagree with. The rest will be a few more regular questions.

160. How would you rate your happiness when you were a child?

1 195 very happy 2 127 fairly happy 3 35 so-so

4 11 fairly unhappy 5 5 very unhappy 7 no answer

161. When you were a child, how much attachment would you say there was between you and your mother?

1 216 very close 2 121 fairly close 3 18 not so close

4 4 no attachment 5 1 dislike

20 no answer, mother died in my infancy, etc.

162. When you were a child, how much attachment would you say there was between you and your father?

1 146 very close 2 151 fairly close 3 48 not so close

4 6 no attachment 5 3 dislike

26 no answer, father died in my infancy, etc.

163. When you were a child, did you feel that you were your mother's favorite, or was a brother or sister of yours her favorite?

1 61 I was favorite 2 16 brother was favorite

3 15 sister was favorite 4 233 no special favorite

5 55 only child, no answer, mother died in my infancy, etc.

IF ONLY CHILD, SKIP TO 165.

164. When you were a child, did you feel that you were your father's favorite, or was a brother or sister his favorite?

1 36 I was favorite 2 22 brother was favorite

3 24 sister was favorite 4 245 no special favorite

5 53 only child, no answer, father died in my infancy, etc.

165. When you were a child, how frequently did you feel that you were not wanted by your mother?

1 0 very often   2 2 pretty often   3 6 sometimes

4 38 rarely   5 311 never   23 no answer, inapplicable

166. When you were a child, how frequently did you feel that you were not wanted by your father?

1 6 very often   2 5 pretty often   3 13 sometimes

4 34 rarely   5 292 never   30 no answer, inapplicable

167. In general, what advice would you give to a young man about to graduate from high school here in (Burlington, Graham, Raleigh)? INTERVIEWER: ENTER ORDER OF MENTION, 1-2-3, ETC.

Item mentioned first:

1 259 go to college   2 28 work hard, get ahead, be somebody, etc.

3 15 settle down, find a job, etc.

4 1 have some fun, raise cain, only young once, etc.

5 62 other (do what you like, self-expression, etc., 20; unclassifiable, 42)

15 no answer

Sources of Items in Interview Schedule

Unless some other source is indicated below, the questions were constructed by Richard L. Simpson and H. Max Miller. Questions 128-157, on attitudes toward work, were constructed by Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson. These were intended to form three scales, on general satisfaction with work, estimate of the prestige of one's work, and identification with one's work group. Application of Guttman scaling procedures to these questions did not produce the three separate scales we had hoped for, and these items were therefore not used in the analysis. David R. Norsworthy and Ida Harper Simpson are currently working with these items, and preliminary indications are that one or two work satisfaction and identification scales will emerge, but not in time for use in this report.

We wish to acknowledge our debt to the sources listed below for the items indicated. In some cases we used modifications of the original items rather than the items themselves; for example, we modified items initially used in self-administered questionnaires so that they could be used in interviews, we modified items initially used to study adolescent aspirations so that they could be used to study adult workers, and we modified items initially used with college students in an effort to make them more understandable to our less educated respondents. Therefore if some of the authors listed below should chance on this acknowledgment, they may not recognize the items we attribute to them, but this does not make our debt to them any less.

Wendell Bell, "Social Choice, Life Styles, and Suburban Residence," in William M. Dobriner (ed.), The Suburban Community, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958, pp. 225-247. Professor Bell kindly supplied us with copies of his questions, which with some modification appear in the interview schedule as items 83, 84, 85.

Russell R. Dynes, Alfred C. Clarke, and Simon Dinitz, "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable," American Sociological Review, 21 (April 1956), pp. 212-215. Items 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166.

Howard S. Gall, "The Functions of Multi-Group Sanctions in the Academic Decisions of Adolescents," unpublished M. A. thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of North Carolina, 1956. Items 35, 36, 37, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58.

Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, 18 (June 1953), pp. 233-242. Item 68.

Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21 (April 1956), pp. 203-211. Items 69, 88, 95, 96, 97, 101, 105, 112.

Morris Rosenberg, with the assistance of Edward A. Suchman and Rose K. Goldsen, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957. Items 34 (part 4), 78, 79, 80, 91, 92, 93, 99, 102, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.

Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries," American Sociological Review, 21 (December 1956), pp. 709-716. Items 87, 90, 91, 92, 93.

Harold Wilensky and Hugh Edwards, "The Skidder: Ideological Adjustments of Downward Mobile Workers," American Sociological Review, 24 (April 1959), pp. 215-231. Items 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75.

Items 98, 103, 107, 110, 111, 113, and 114 are taken with modifications from a study conducted by Robert Agger, Marshall Goldstein, and others then at the University of North Carolina in 1957-1958. Similar questions are found in T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper, 1950.

APPENDIX C

HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE AND MARGINAL RESPONSES
(BOYS ONLY)

OCCUPATIONAL STUDY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

You are asked to fill out this questionnaire to aid in a social science research project being carried on at the University of North Carolina.

Please indicate your answer by putting a check mark in the appropriate blank. In a few places, special instructions will be given. Please read these carefully when you come to them.

Your replies will be kept confidential. You do not need to sign your name to this questionnaire.

Pay no attention to the numbers beside the questions. They are for our use in analyzing your answers on an electronic computer.

1-4. These IBM card columns were used for questionnaire identification number, which included our code for grade (10th, 11th, 12th) and school (Wilson or High Point).

5. How old are you?

120 15 or younger 296 16 301 17 172 18 26 19 or older

2 no answer

6. Are you a

1 917 male 2 0 female 0 no answer

7. What kind of program of study are you taking up in high school?

1 515 Academic. 2 325 General. 3 1 Vocational Agriculture.

4 13 Vocational, Industrial Arts. 5 45 Commercial.

6 18 Other, no answer.

8. Are your mother and father now living?

1 829 Both living. 2 12 Father only is living.

3 72 Mother only is living. 4 2 Neither is living.

5 2 No answer.

9. (IF BOTH OF YOUR PARENTS ARE LIVING) Are your parents living together, or are they separated?

1 754 Living together. 2 108 Not living together

55 No answer, both parents not living.

10-12. What kind of work does your father (guardian) do? (PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DUTIES OF HIS POSITION, NOT JUST THE PLACE WHERE HE WORKS.)

Census category of father's occupation:

47 Professional, semiprofessional, technical, and kindred.

220 Managers, proprietors, and officials, except farm.

150 Clerical, sales, and kindred.

233 Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred.

144 Operatives and kindred (e.g., semiskilled, service workers, policemen, firemen).

41 Farmers and farm workers, all types.

3 Laborers except farm.

109 No answer, father not living.

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status of father's occupation:

29 1 65 2 139 3 189 4 265 5 117 6 5 7

108 No answer, father not living.

Career group of father's occupation (Note: this classification devised by David R. Norsworthy):

29 Professional 233 Business (self-employed and salaried managers.

154 Other nonmanual (residual sales, clerical, technicians, semi-professional).

351 Manual other than farm, including service workers if non-professional.

41 Farm 109 No answer, father not living.

13-15. What kind of work did your father (guardian) do five years ago?

Census category:

53 Professional, semiprofessional, technical, and kindred.

215 Managers, proprietors, and officials, except farm.

145 Clerical, sales, and kindred.

231 Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred.

140 Operatives and kindred (e.g., semiskilled, service workers, policemen, firemen).

48 Farmers and farm workers, all types.

4 Laborers except farm.

81 No answer, father not living then.

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status:

24 1 69 2 136 3 189 4 272 5 140 6

6 7 81 No answer, father not living then.

Career group:

33 Professional 228 Business (self-employed and salaried managers).

152 Other nonmanual (residual sales, clerical, technicians, semi-professional).

376 Manual other than farm, including service workers if non-professional.

47 Farm. 108 No answer, father not living then.

16. Does your mother have a job?

1 478 Yes. 2 426 No. 13 No answer, mother deceased.

17. (IF YES TO NO. 16) What kind of work does your mother do? (AGAIN, DESCRIBE THE DUTIES.)

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status:

3 1 40 2 26 3 138 4 33 5 189 6 14 7

474 No answer, mother deceased, mother does not work.

18-19. Please check the categories which give the amount of education your parents received.

Father	Mother	
7 26	20	0-6 years.
6 89	104	7-9 years.
5 68	60	10-11 years, did not graduate from high school.
4 186	298	high school graduate.
3 149	182	some college, did not graduate.
2 224	163	college graduate.
1 90	38	professional or graduate education after college graduation.
85	52	no answer.

20. How long have you lived in this community (or in the area near this community)?

1 495 all my life. 2 220 more than 9 years but not all my life.

3 158 between 2 and 9 years. 4 38 less than 2 years.

6 no answer.

21. (IF YOU HAVE LIVED ELSEWHERE) Where was the main place you lived before you came to this area (this community or nearby surroundings) to live? Please give the town or city, or, if rural, the county and state you lived in.

51 same county. 181 different county in North Carolina.

151 different state. 534 no answer, inapplicable.

22. Are you now living

1 682 in town? 2 180 in the suburbs or fringe outside of town?

3 54 in the open country? 1 no answer.

23. What are your plans regarding college?

1 191 I do not plan to go. 2 210 I may go, and I may not.

3 151 I will go if I can afford it.

4 364 I definitely expect to go. 1 No answer.

24. Are you having much trouble in deciding what will be your career?

1 214 Yes, I'm having a lot of trouble.

2 525 I'm having some trouble.

3 175 I'm having no trouble at all.

3 No answer.

25-26. As of right now, what occupation are you planning to take up as your career?

Hollingshead Index of Occupational Status of intended career:

270 1 117 2 114 3 54 4 121 5 71 6 1 7

169 No answer.

Career group of intended career:

360 professional 81 business 91 other nonmanual

181 manual, nonfarm 15 farm

21 glamorous occupation (e.g., pilot, space man, professional athlete)

167 no answer.

27. What would you like better about this kind of work than about some other kind?

482 aspects of the work itself

46 altruism, service, religious motives, etc.

77 money.

18 prestige, glamour.

294 other, unclassifiable, no answer.

28. If you could have just any occupation in the world that you wanted, which occupation would you choose?

Career group:

300 professional   99 business   47 other nonmanual

71 manual, nonfarm   12 farm   179 glamorous

209 no answer.

29. And what is the reason why you would pick this occupation rather than some other?

370 aspects of the work itself

59 altruism, service, religious motives, etc.

85 money

139 prestige, glamour

263 other, unclassifiable, no answer.

30. Which of the people listed below have you already talked to about what you want to do for your career? Check as many or as few as you want.

(Note: The following were listed: mother, father, other relatives, friends, teachers, people in the occupation you expect to take up, others. Responses were coded as below.)

102 relatives only   153 relatives and friends

128 relatives (including mother, father) and "residual" (teachers, people in the occupation, and/or unspecified others)

23 friends only   15 friends and residual

447 relatives, friends, and residual   13 residual only

35 no answer.

31-36. For **each** of the people listed below, check the column which says how much influence that person has had on your career plans.

		Much	Some	None	No Answer
31.	Mother	1 299	2 371	3 156	91
32.	Father	1 320	2 331	3 141	125
33.	Other relatives	1 104	2 330	3 228	255
34.	Friends	1 95	2 367	3 216	238
35.	Teachers	1 114	2 254	3 224	325
36.	People in the occupation you expect to take up	1 258	2 174	3 163	322

37. Do you know someone who is in the occupation you plan to go into?

1 613 Yes.   2 260 No.   44 No answer.

38. (IF YES) Whom do you know in that occupation?

1 77 my father.   2 8 my mother.   3 171 another relative.

4 331 a friend.   5 142 other.   294 no answer, inapplicable.

39. How much influence has your knowing this person had in your developing an interest in that same occupation?

1 216 very much.   2 136 fairly much   3 151 some

4 78 only a little.   5 83 none.   253 no answer, inapplicable.

40-45. For **each** of the people listed below, check the column which tells how much it would bother you if that person disapproved strongly of the occupation you had chosen.

		Much	Some	None	No Answer
40.	Mother	1 368	2 283	3 178	88
41.	Father	1 353	2 246	3 180	138
42.	Other relatives	1 62	2 241	3 401	213
43.	Friends	1 47	2 234	3 440	196
44.	Teachers	1 75	2 217	3 373	252
45.	People in the occupation you expect to take up	1 235	2 194	3 215	273

46. Has your father suggested some occupation for you to go into?

(Note: Possible answers were, 1, No, he has said nothing about it; 2, Yes, he would like for me to be a _____. Responses were coded as below.)

106 professional   37 business   29 other nonmanual

55 manual, nonfarm   7 farm   4 glamorous

496 has not suggested anything   183 no answer, father deceased.

47. What about your mother--has she suggested an occupation for you?

91 professional   21 business   36 other nonmanual

28 manual, nonfarm   5 farm   5 glamorous

525 has not suggested anything   206 no answer, mother deceased.

48. Have you had any vocational counseling so far through your school?

1 403 Yes,   2 490 No.   24 No answer.

49. (IF YES TO NO. 48) Has that counseling affected your plans for a career?

1 106 Yes, it helped me to make up my mind.

2 171 Yes, it started me thinking for the first time about my career.

3 145 No, the counseling has not affected my plans.

495 No answer, not applicable.

50. How old were you when you first thought about going into the kind of work you now expect to go into?

1 16 5 years old or younger.   2 45 6 to 9 years old.

3 49 10 or 11 years old.   4 136 12 or 13 years old.

5 159 14 years old.   6 192 15 years old.

7 140 16 years old   8 71 17 years old.

9 23 18 years old or older.   86 no answer.

51. How much money do you expect to be making 10 years after you leave school?

1 21 about $2,000 a year (or about 40 dollars a week).

2 49 about $3,000 a year (or about 60 dollars a week).

3 113 about $4,000 a year (or about 80 dollars a week).

4 153 about $5,000 a year (or about 100 dollars a week).

5 173 between $5,000 and $7,000 a year.

6 139 between $7,000 and $10,000 a year.

7 95 between $10,000 and $15,000 a year.

8 112 over $15,000 a year.

62 no answer.

52. One person may like a job where he is a part of an organization, working with other people as a team. Another might prefer a job where he does his own work and gets individual credit for it himself. What kind of job do you think is better—one where you work as part of an organization or one where you work as an individual?

1 539 Organization   2 339 Individual.   39 No answer

53. Try to think about how your present family compares with families in general, in over-all social standing or prestige. Then check in the box below which gives the most accurate rating of your family.

1 [140] The highest-ranking ¼ of the families.
2 [549] The next ¼.
3 [182] The next ¼.
4 [12] The lowest-ranking ¼ of the families.
34 No answer.

54. Looking ahead to the time when you will have a family of your own, how do you expect your future family to compare with other families then, in general social standing or prestige? Check the appropriate box below.

1 [320] The highest-ranking ¼ of the families.
2 [516] The next ¼.
3 [39] The next ¼.
4 [6] The lowest-ranking ¼ of the families.
35 No answer.

55-56. Below are four things about an occupation, each of which might have something to do with how satisfied a person would be with that occupation. We should like to know how important you think each of these things is. Please write a "1" by the feature you think most important, a "2" by the one second in importance, a "3" by the one third in importance, and a "4" by the least important feature.

	Most Important	Least Important	
1	277	95	Interesting and challenging work.
2	72	405	Plenty of money and prestige.
3	253	74	Security and stability (steady work).
4	202	177	Service to humanity, chance to help people.
	113	166	No answer.

57. Do you know what kind of work the fathers of three of your best friends do? If so, would you describe the kind of work they do? (NOT THEIR NAMES.)

239 all nonmanual.

383 some nonmanual, some manual (including farm).

167 all manual (including farm).

127 no answer.

58. To what clubs and other organizations do you belong? Write in as many as you belong to. (Note: Five spaces were provided.)

Number of organizations listed:

286 0 174 1 170 2 101 3 82 4 96 5

7 6 or more

59. How much does it bother you to have to give orders to other people?

1 78 It bothers me very much.

2 434 It bothers me a little.

3 385 It doesn't bother me at all.

21 No answer.

60. Name three of the things that you spend most of your time doing when you are not in school.

33 only study or work mentioned.

579 study or work plus leisure activity mentioned.

56 only lone leisure mentioned (e.g., reading).

29 only group leisure mentioned (e.g., dating, hanging around with the crowd).

194 lone leisure plus group leisure mentioned.

26 no answer.

61. Which one of the persons listed below do you want most to be like when you are older?

1 45 one of my teachers. 2 231 a friend of mine.

3 29 mother. 4 189 father.

5 39 Fabian. 6 52 brother or sister.

7 20 George Washington. 8 142 other (specify___).

170 no answer.

62. How much does it bother you to be given orders by someone else?

1 133 It bothers me very much.

2 421 It bothers me a little.

3 355 It doesn't bother me at all.

8 No answer.

The following are statements which some people agree with, and others do not. Please check the blank which most nearly approximates your own feeling about each statement.

(Note: The categories for each question were, 1, definitely agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, definitely disagree. These are indicated below by 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, with NA indicating no answer.)

63. If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.

331 1 408 2 136 3 31 4 11 NA

64. Most people are more likely to look out for themselves than they are to help others.

370 1 379 2 132 3 26 4 10 NA

65. No matter what they say, most people are really jealous when you get ahead.

172 1 404 2 244 3 87 4 10 NA

66. You can't be too careful in your dealings with people.

350 1 372 2 160 3 27 4 8 NA

67. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.

91 1 183 2 280 3 357 4 6 NA

68. The way to be happy in life is to be satisfied with whatever you have.

434 1 184 2 138 3 53 4 8 NA

69. Most boys should try to get better jobs than their fathers have.

327 1 394 2 136 3 48 4 11 NA

70. It is wrong for a person to be dissatisfied with his position in life.

182 1 231 2 210 3 283 4 11 NA

71. We are all born to our various social positions, and should not change them.

57 1 98 2 201 3 556 4 5 NA

72. If a young person is ambitious, he will usually not let anything keep him from getting ahead.

529 1 258 2 98 3 24 4 8 NA

73. A lot of people could get along all right without doing so much at their jobs.

87 1 293 2 288 3 234 4 15 NA

74. If you try to do a job, and find it hard, there's no use to keep plugging at it.

43 1 64 2 168 3 636 4 6 NA

75. I would usually rather be working than loafing.

581 1 220 2 45 3 65 4 6 NA

76. I would never like to have a work week as short as 30 hours.

320 1 281 2 174 3 128 4 14 NA

77. There's no point in doing any sort of work that you don't have to do.

90 1 112 2 288 3 419 4 8 NA

Sources of Items in High School Questionnaire

David R. Norsworthy, with some assistance from Richard L. Simpson, constructed this questionnaire. Items taken or adapted from other sources are indicated below.

Howard S. Gall, "The Functions of Multi-Group Sanctions in the Academic Decisions of Adolescents," unpublished M. A. thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of North Carolina, 1956. Items 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.

Morris Rosenberg, with the assistance of Edward A. Suchman and Rose K. Goldsen, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957. Items 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67.

EPILOGUE

We have presented the full questionnaire and interview schedule and patterns of response to the individual items partly as information for the curious, and partly in the belief that they might be of help to other research workers. Questions which are answered alike by almost all respondents are of little value, and others may wish to avoid using these, at least in research on populations similar to those we used. On the positive side, questions which successfully differentiated respondents in varying ways may be of potential value in future research. Especially when scales are being constructed, it is helpful to have some advance notion of the likely response patterns, and a knowledge of the results obtained in earlier studies can reduce the time and effort of pre-testing.

The charts which were used by interviewers to record information about the sources of personal influence on job decisions proved to be useful. Anyone who may be interested in seeing these, or who may want to see the actual format of the interview schedule and questionnaire, can obtain copies by writing to the principal investigator, Richard L. Simpson, at the Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

An additional reason why we have included these questions and answers in this report is to give some idea of the scope of data collected, since analysis is under way or planned which will extend the findings beyond those given here. Our intention in this report has been to cover the ground indicated in the research proposal on the basis of which the Office of Education agreed to support the research, with the necessary modifications indicated in Appendix A. We hope that we have done this successfully, but much more remains to be done with the data. In some instances, questions did not produce satisfactory scales as we originally hoped they would, but will be usable after work now in process is completed. In other instances, hindsight has suggested new ways of analyzing the data, but the realization came too late to be reflected in this report. In still other instances, the experience of analyzing the data has produced entirely new leads for research, some of which involve occupational choice and mobility only indirectly or not at all but can be pursued with the data which were collected with this topic in mind.

APPENDIX D

ABSTRACT

This is a study of occupational choice and occupational career patterns in four North Carolina communities. Data were obtained from interviews with 380 white male adult workers randomly selected from two communities, and from questionnaires administered to 917 white high school boys in two other communities. The study was jointly supported by the Office of Education and the Urban Studies Program of the University of North Carolina; the latter was supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation. Separate chapters of the report deal with different kinds of findings.

SOCIAL ORIGINS, MIGRATION, AND VERTICAL MOBILITY

This phase of the research explores the effects of social backgrounds and migration patterns on work opportunities and careers. Work histories and related information were obtained from 380 workers, to answer several kinds of questions. How do men's occupations in a modern community differ from those of their fathers, and what are some of the things that seem to account for the differences? To what extent are workers' career lines determined by the first jobs they take when they enter the labor market? What role does migration play in the movement from one job to another? In what ways do advantages and disadvantages of social background affect work careers? Some findings are summarized below.

1. Intergenerational mobility in Piedmont North Carolina seems to follow the same basic patterns as have been found in studies of other American communities and in studies covering the entire United States. We

found in our sample of workers the usual tendency toward inheritance of general occupational level, coupled with a substantial amount of upward intergenerational mobility and a lesser amount of downward mobility.

2. Our findings on career mobility—movement into higher or lower occupational levels during the work career—differ from earlier findings as summarized by Rogoff. She reports that previous studies generally find no more than 50 per cent of the labor force moving out of the Census level of the first full-time job. We found that more than four-fifths of the workers currently in the Census categories of "managers, proprietors, and officials" and "skilled workers and foremen" had begun at lower levels. Workers currently in other Census categories had followed the pattern described by Rogoff, with about half or more in each category still in the levels where they began; but even in these groups, some additional upward mobility would occur at later career stages. A probable explanation for this high rate of upward career mobility is that Piedmont North Carolina has been in a somewhat earlier stage of industrialization than areas where other studies have been conducted; early industrialization usually produces high rates of upward mobility. Our data do not tell us why if career mobility rates have been high, intergenerational mobility rates have not also been high.

3. Lipset and Bendix have presented evidence that the larger the community in which a worker grows up, the more successful he is likely to be in urban labor market competition. Our findings generally agree with theirs, but show some variations in the case of the farm-reared. In our sample, a farm-reared worker with a high school diploma was as likely as a worker from a town smaller than 50,000—though less likely than a worker from a city larger than 50,000—to hold a high-ranking job when interviewed; but the

farm-reared worker was less likely than the town-reared worker to have begun his career at a high level. From this it seems evident that the farm-reared high school graduates were more likely than town-reared high school graduates to have moved up during their careers.

4. Long-distance migration was associated with high occupational status. Large percentages of the workers in the higher-status jobs were from other states. This means that a Southern state like North Carolina attracts many college graduates from other states, though it perhaps loses even more of its own college graduates to other states. The labor market for high-status jobs is more cosmopolitan, less local than the labor market for manual and lesser white-collar work.

5. Lipset and Bendix speak of the "cumulation of advantages or disadvantages." Low parental status, farm or small-town origin, and lack of education together handicap a worker more than any of them separately would. High parental status, metropolitan origin, and high educational attainment together put the worker in the best possible position. Our findings support this hypothesis of cumulative effects, but the amount of education a worker has received has far more effect on his job chances than either of the other factors has.

SOCIAL ORIGINS, VALUES, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, AND WORK CAREERS

Earlier research has shown that class background, personal influence, and occupational values are all related to a worker's job opportunities and to the process by which he chooses a career. The second main phase of this study explores these relationships, and attempts to see whether the relationships of background, personal influence, and values to occupational career patterns are independent of each other. Data are from interviews with 380 workers. Some findings follow.

1. As predicted, class background, personal influence, and values were related to the status level of workers' first jobs. A worker was likely to have had a high-ranking first job if his father was of high status, if he had received occupational advice from a large number of people, if his main occupational adviser had been someone outside his family, and if the nature of work played a more important part than extrinsic considerations in his decision to accept his first job.

2. No matter what values and sources of advice the worker cited as having influenced his choice of a first job, he was very likely to begin his career in a high-ranking job if his father held a high-ranking job. Values and advice appear to have had some effect on first-job levels, however, independently of father's status, though the support for this finding is not entirely consistent. Non-family main advisers and "intrinsic" occupational values seem to represent knowledge of available job opportunities and awareness to the need to seek advice and exercise judgment in choosing an occupation.

3. Formal vocational counseling in the schools had very little effect on the careers of these workers. So few workers attributed any influence to counseling that our data on this subject cannot be considered very trustworthy, but the findings suggest that formal vocational counseling has its greatest impact on students from working-class families who are upwardly mobile into the lower white-collar ranks.

4. There was a marked shift from the nature of work as a value influencing the choice of first jobs to career considerations as a value influencing the choice of subsequent jobs, especially among men whose current jobs were at the executive or professional level. A possible reason for the change is that many workers give serious thought to the nature of the work they are entering when they choose their basic career lines, and are only dimly aware of the differing possibilities for advancement in various fields; but by the time they are ready to change jobs later on, they are committed to a general type of work and look mainly for advancement within this field.

5. An attempt was made to test the hypothesis that workers who had experienced upward intergenerational and career mobility would have strong achievement drives. The results were inconclusive, possibly because the questions we used to measure achievement drive were poorly chosen rather than because the hypothesis was invalid.

SOCIAL ORIGINS, PERSONAL INFLUENCE, AND CAREER PLANS

This phase of the research attempted to discover the relationships of social background, values, and personal influence to occupational plans among high school boys. Data are from questionnaires completed by 917 white high school boys in two communities. Some findings follow.

1. As one would expect, there was a strong relationship between the occupational status of boys' fathers and the status levels of the occupations they planned to take up. The higher the status of the father, the more likely the son was to plan a high-status career, to expect a high income, to plan to attend college, and to be enrolled in the college preparatory curriculum.

2. Other variables were less strongly and less consistently related to father's status. There was some tendency for sons of high-status father, more than sons of low-status fathers, to have first considered the occupations they currently planned to enter when they were 14 or younger, to be experiencing little difficulty in deciding on occupations, to have received advice from numerous sources including their fathers (but not necessarily their mothers), and to have been advised by their parents to enter professions. The relation between father's status and the likelihood that the mother had suggested some occupation was not consistent. Fathers were about twice as likely as mothers to have suggested manual occupations; when the mothers had given advice, the suggested occupations were usually professions.

3. Boys expecting to have occupational careers at different status levels did not differ markedly or consistently in the reasons they gave for having chosen their intended occupations; regardless of the level of expectation, most boys cited some intrinsic aspect of their expected work as the main reason for having chosen it. When the boys were asked what feature of an occupation might make a person most satisfied with it, the main finding was a fairly direct relationship between high occupational aspiration and the tendency to name "interesting and challenging work" as the most important occupational feature. Two items meant to measure "ambition" produced inconsistent results. All things considered, these value items did not discriminate very well between boys planning careers at different status level

4. Relationships between level of expected occupation and sources of advice were inconsistent.

5. Since the hypotheses concerning occupational values and personal influence as correlates of expected occupational careers were not clearly or consistently supported, we are left with father's status as the only one of our variables which satisfactorily predicts the son's occupational aspirations. These results may suggest that there is a certain unreality in trying to study occupational choice among high school boys with standard survey procedures using pre-coded questionnaires. Very few of these boys have any clear idea of what they intend to do in life, and very few have systematically considered alternative occupations in a way that would give genuine meaning to their answers to questions like those we asked about occupational values and sources of occupational advice. The same kinds of variables which we found to be related to actual careers among adult workers were very inconsistently related to career plans among high school students. Our findings as a whole, in conjunction with findings from earlier studies using college students as subjects, suggest that the planning of an occupational career does not become very concrete or systematic until the person is at the point of making an actual decision. This decision may involve the first full-time job he takes, or it may take the form of choosing a course of study in college.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

6·26·67